

Group

FO

Class

406

Piece

49

N

08

EASTERN PRINT

PART 10

January 1922

to June 1922.



CONFIDENTIAL.

(12068)

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING

EASTERN AFFAIRS.

—
PART X
—

JANUARY TO JUNE 1922.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No. and Name.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page.
Chapter I.—THE CAUCASUS.			
1 Mr. Hodgson (Moscow) No. 277	1922 May 9	Caucasian Federation. Reports conclusion of agreement on the 10th March, between representatives of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan	1
2 Mr. Childs and Mr. McDonald	" 31	Events in Transcaucasia from Russian revolution in summer 1917 to April 1921	1
Chapter II.—TURKEY.			
3 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 1206	1921 Dec. 31	Visit to Minister for Foreign Affairs. Discussion respecting (i) Angora representative, Hamid Bey; (ii) forthcoming meeting of Allied Foreign Ministers in Paris; (iii) minorities in Turkey	35
4 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 13	1922 Jan. 3	Heads of missions in Constantinople. Transmits report	36
5 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 14	" 8	Mahmoud Mukhtar Pasha. Reports interview and facts connected with his possible selection as Grand Vizier	39
6 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 16	" 8	Difficulties with Allied representatives. Reports action by French High Commissioner regarding inter-Allied co-operation	40
7 Sir P. Lorcins Confidential	1921 Dec. 11	Irak. Records long conversation with King Faisal respecting, <i>inter alia</i> , French policy in Turkey	41
8 Mr. Lindley (Athens) No. 7. Conf.	1922 Jan. 6	Situation in Turkey. Gives views of Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs, who would go any lengths in making concessions to Turks if peace could be obtained thereby	44
9 Mr. Lindley (Athens) No. 11	" 7	Greece-Turkish situation. Records interview with MM. Gounaris and Baltazzi	45
10 Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 123	" 13	Armenian refugees from Cilicia going to Constantinople. Transmits French note that French authorities did not encourage	46
11 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 56	" 14	Treaty between Angora and Ukraine. Transmits text	47
12 Sir R. Graham (Rome) No. 49	" 20	Article in "Messaggero" reporting alleged British negotiations with Angora. Transmits, and reports representations to Minister for Foreign Affairs respecting	50
13 French Ambassador	" 27	Allied Foreign Ministers' meeting in Paris on the 1st February. Transmits French outline of points to be discussed at	51
14 To Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 314	" 30	Allied meeting in Paris. Replies in detail to No. 13	56
15 Mr. Childs	" 30	Conversation with M. Franklin-Brownell on the 27th January. Records his views on situation in Turkey, &c.	60

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

271

No. and Name.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page.
16 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 70	1922 Jan. 19	Turkish Government. Rumours that Mahmud Mukhtar may assume office	63
17 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 71	" 19	Thrace. Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs respecting	64
18 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 83	" 21	Nationalist representative, Hamid Bey. Reports conversation with, re Græco-Turkish conflict	64
19 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 83	" 23	French Cabinet crisis. Transmits Nationalist press article respecting	67
20 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 95	" 24	Nationalists. Reviews situation and possible developments at Angora	68
21 Sir R. Graham (Rome) No. 84. Conf.	" 27	Allied Foreign Ministers' meeting in Paris. Italian views and conclusions respecting agenda, and revision of Treaty of Sèvres (see No. 25)	70
22 Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 300	Feb. 2	French protectorate over Catholics in the east. Transmits note to French Government pressing them to inform Vatican of their renunciation of (see Nos. 85 and 49a)	74
23 Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 308	" 3	Allied meeting in Paris. Refers to No. 14. Transmits French note and memorandum respecting possible action by Entente Powers (see No. 29)	76
24 To Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 351	" 4	Turkish gendarmerie. To protest against action of Colonel Sarrau (see No. 45)	84
25 Memorandum	" 4	Revision of Treaty of Sèvres. Financial clauses. Refers to No. 21. Interdepartmental comments on Italian proposals	85
26 "	" 6	Means of bringing pressure on Turkey. Enumerates possible action	86
27 Mr. Ryan	" 7	Turkish peace prospects. Enumerates possible courses of action and submits draft of Act	90
28 "	" 9	Greek evacuation of Asia Minor. Views on possible consequences arising from	90
29 To Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 426	" 12	Allied meeting in Paris. Refers to No. 28. To express appreciation of M. Poincaré's attitude	94
30 Sir A. Black (Constantinople) to Treasury	Jan. 24	Revision of Treaty of Sèvres. Views respecting possible attitude of Nationalists towards	94
31 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 133	Feb. 3	Ecumenical Patriarch. Reports visit by Apostolic delegate on. Possible consequences	96
32 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 136	" 5	Nationalist attitude towards Entente. Reports impending visit of Yusuf Kemal Bey to Europe	96
33 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 139	" 6	Armenians in Cilicia. Transmits extracts respecting evictions of Christians from Cilicia	97
34 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 145. Secret [8975]	" 7	Armenian activities in Anatolia. Transmits details respecting	98

No. and Name.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page.
35 Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 373	1922 Feb. 13	French protectorate over Catholics in East. Refers to No. 22. Transmits French reply definitely claiming this right in Ottoman Empire (see Nos. 44a and 75)	100
36 To Sir R. Graham (Rome) No. 126	" 14	Allied meeting in Paris. Records conversation with Italian Ambassador, and protest against Italian attitude (see No. 44)	102
37 Mr. Ryan	" 17	Turkish peace prospects. Discusses possible sources of action	103
38 Mr. Lindley (Athens) No. 82	" 11	Greece-Turkish conflict. Greek press eulogies of Lord Curzon's speech in House of Lords	106
39 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 161	" 14	Nationalist demands respecting Near East settlement. Transmits twenty-five points	106
40 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 164	" 14	Tyros (Eastern and Western). Transmits memorandum of journey by Mr. Knox	107
41 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 171	" 14	British Embassy at Therapia. Reports destruction of secretaries' house by fire	108
42 Count de Salis (Vatican Mission) No. 21	" 14	French protectorate over Catholics in East. Reports conversation with Cardinal Secretary of State and transmits note to him respecting (see No. 65)	109
43 M. Gounaris	" 15	Greece-Turkish conflict. Reviews situation and emphasizes dangers if Greece is not supported (see No. 55)	110
44 Sir R. Graham (Rome) No. 153	" 17	Allied meeting in Paris. Refers to No. 86. Comments on Italian mentality respecting	113
44a Mr. Bradlam-Morley	" 22	Future of Constantinople and the Straits. Memorandum on Russo-British Agreement of 1915 respecting	114
45 Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 482	" 24	Turkish gendarmerie. Refers to No. 24. Transmits French reply respecting Lieutenant-Colonel Barrau	119
46 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 178	" 16	French protectorate over Catholics in East. Reasons why he and Italian colleagues did not attend <i>Te Deum</i> for coronation of Pope Pius XI	120
47 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 185	" 16	Nationalist Minister for Foreign Affairs. Reports conversation with Yussuf Kemal, who begins to appreciate difficulties ahead	122
48 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 196	" 21	Allied meeting in Paris. Views of his French colleague respecting	125
48a Sir R. Graham (Rome) No. 161	" 22	French protectorate over Catholics in East. Refers to No. 22. Italian Government shares British view	125*
49 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 211	" 26	Anatolia. Reports impressions of M. Mére of Ottoman Public Debt respecting situation in	126
50 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 212	" 26	Nationalists. Transmits appreciation of Yussuf Kemal's visit and present position	134
51 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 213	" 28	Near East settlement. Conversation with Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs respecting	126

No. and Name.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page.
52 Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 564	1922 Mar. 4	Muslim institute and mosque in Paris. Reports foundation of	126
53 To M. Gounaris	" 6	Greece-Turkish conflict. Refers to No. 43. Urges diplomatic solution of present difficulty	126
54 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 226	" 6	Nationalist Assembly. Transmits report of speech by Mustapha Kemal, and calls attention to passages respecting foreign policy	127
55 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 226	" 6	Nationalist Assembly. Transmits text of speeches at Russian Soviet Embassy, Angora, on the 3rd March	129
56 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 229, Conf.	" 7	Turkish missions to Europe. Reports departure of Nationalist Minister for Foreign Affairs and also of Izet Pasha	130
57 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 231	" 7	Nationalists at Constantinople. Records conversation with Grand Vizier respecting recent visit by Yussuf Kemal to the Sultan, &c.	131
58 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 233	" 7	Nationalists. Reports activities of	132
59 D.O.T.	" 13	French interests in Turkey. Transmits memorandum summarizing, and also mentioning German	138
60 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 234	" 14	American interests. Reports visit from Mr. Ochs, of "New York Times," and discusses question in detail (see No. 27)	137
61 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 235	" 13	Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs' visit to Europe. Reports conversation with Grand Vizier respecting	139
62 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 234	"	Greek coercive measures towards Moslems. Transmits protest from Turkish Government and despatch from Sir H. Lamb	140
63 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 259	Mar. 14	National Assembly. Reports declarations made in, respecting Turkish missions to Europe	142
64 Mr. Rendel	" 20	Turkish transgressions and persecution of minorities since the armistice. Detailed memorandum respecting	144
65 Count de Salis (Vatican Mission) No. 40	" 2	French protectorate over Catholics in the East. Refers to No. 42. Transmits Vatican's reply respecting to be told result of representations at Paris (see No. 66a)	151
66 Minutes	" 22	Allied meeting in Paris. First meeting on the 22nd March (see Nos. 66 and 104)	154
66a Count de Salis No. 44	" 14	French protectorate over Catholics in East. Refers to No. 65. Reports conversation with Cardinal Gasparri	162*
67 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 233	" 21	Population of Turkey. Reports on, basing calculations on salt consumption	163
68 Minutes	" 23	Allied meeting in Paris. Refers to No. 66. Second meeting, the 23rd March	165
69 "	" 23	Allied meeting in Paris. Third meeting, the 23rd March	168
70 "	" 24	Allied meeting in Paris. Fourth meeting, the 24th March (see No. 74)	178

No. and Name.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page.
71 Memorandum	1922 Mar. 27	Allied meeting in Paris. Pronouncement by the three Allied Foreign Ministers (see Nos. 93 and 94)	183
72 "	" 30	Allied meeting in Paris. Lord Curzon's speech in House of Lords, the 30th March	187
73 To Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 940	Apr. 1	French protectorate over Catholics in the East. Refers to No. 85. Instructions regarding reply to be sent to French Government (see No. 113a)	198
74 Minutes	Mar. 24	Allied meeting in Paris. Refers to No. 70. Fifth meeting, the 24th March	200
75 "	" 25	Allied meeting in Paris. Sixth meeting, the 25th March	209
76 "	" 25	Allied meeting in Paris. Seventh meeting, the 25th March	216
77 "	" 26	Allied meeting in Paris. Eighth meeting, the 26th March	224
78 "	" 26	Allied meeting in Paris. Ninth meeting, the 26th March	230
79 "	" 26	Allied meeting in Paris. Tenth meeting, the 26th March. Text of covering letter to Greek and Turkish Ministers for Foreign Affairs (see Nos. 89 and 158)	232
80 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 306. Conf.	" 26	Greece-Turkish conflict. Grand Vizier raises question of an armistice	243
81 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 307	" 28	Greece-Turkish conflict. Transmits note from Grand Vizier respecting	245
82 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 308	" 29	Kardian. Reports attitude of Nationalists and summary of draft law respecting	346
83 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 310	" 28	Greece-Turkish conflict. Press comments on possible armistice	349
84 Sir H. Graham (Rome) No. 292	" 31	Allied meeting in Paris. Press views respecting	349
85 Mr. Amisage-Smith to Treasury	Apr. 3	Revision of Treaty of Sèvres. Views respecting new financial clauses	269
86 French Ambassador	" 4	Allied meetings in Paris. Transmits French text of resolutions respecting (1) evacuation of Asia Minor; (2) minorities; (3) Armenia; (4) Thrace; (5) demilitarized zone; (6) armed forces of Turkey; (7) finances; (8) Capitulations. Requests concurrence (see Nos. 91 and 158)	255
87 French Ambassador	" 7	Greek evacuation of Asia Minor. Transmits note from Ankara, and proposes reply (see No. 90)	260
88 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 316. Conf.	" 2	Greece-Turkish conflict. Conversation with Grand Vizier respecting. Settlement proposed by Allied Ministers in Paris	262
89 French Chargé d'Affaires	" 10	Greece-Turkish conflict. Transmits Turkish Government's reply to proposals of Allied Ministers in No. 79	263
90 "	" 10	Greece-Turkish conflict. Transmits draft reply to No. 87	264

No. and Name.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page.
91 To French Ambassador	1922 Apr. 10	Allied meeting in Paris. Refers to No. 86. Agrees to French texts subject to certain observations	265
92 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 352. Conf.	" 10	Audience of Sultan. Reports discussion on whole Turkish question (see No. 94)	266
93 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 353	" 10	Greece-Turkish conflict. Reports discussion with Hamid Bey on Ankara's reply to Allied armistice proposals. Refers to No. 71	270
94 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 354	" 10	Greece-Turkish conflict. Refers to No. 71. Transmits reply of Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs to Allied armistice proposals	271
95 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 357. Conf.	" 11	Sultan. Refers to No. 92. Transmits memorandum by Mr. Ryan giving account of a conversation with a member of the Sultan's entourage	273
95a Sir H. Graham (Rome) No. 360	" 16	French protectorate over Catholics in the East. Semi-official communiqué in Italian press regarding	277*
96 Mr. Lindley (Athens) No. 162	" 6	Greece-Turkish conflict. Reports unanimous hostility of Greek press to Allied peace proposals, and debate in Assembly	274
97 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 373	" 18	Eccumenical Patriarch. Report of Mr. Ryan's interview with, at Easter (see No. 100)	277
97a Count de Salis (Vatican Mission) No. 44	" 21	French protectorate over Catholics in the East. General Giannini's audience of the Pope	279*
98 To Italian Ambassador	" 27	Italy-Turkish Agreement. Protests against signature of agreement for conversions in Turkey (see Nos. 111, 113, 116 and 128)	279
99 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 381	" 24	Nationalists. Appointment to administrative posts under Ankara of men notorious for persecution of Christians (see No. 101)	281
100 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 385	" 26	Eccumenical Patriarch. Refers to No. 97. Attitude of, towards events in Asia Minor	281
101 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 389	" 25	Nationalists. Refers to No. 98. Reports conversation with Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs regarding administrative appointments of Ankara Government	284
102 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 390	" 25	Near East settlement. Transmits Ankara Government's reply to Allied note of the 15th April, and comments thereon (see No. 105)	284
103 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 391	" 26	Nationalists. Attitude of Ankara Government towards Constantinople Government	288
104 War Office Secret	" 29	Greece-Turkish conflict. Refers to No. 66. Discusses means of postulating reinforcements, &c., reaching belligerents during armistice	290
105 Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 1673	May 1	Near East settlement. Transmits M. Poincaré's views regarding attitude of Allies to reply of Ankara Government. Refers to No. 102	291
106 Sir H. Humbold (Constantinople) No. 399	Apr. 30	Near East settlement. Transmits Porte's reply to Allied peace proposals (see No. 112)	292

No. and Name.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
107 Mr. Hodgson (Moscow) No. 280. Secret	1922 May 1	Nationalists and Russia. Ali Fehmi Pasha, the Ankara Ambassador at Moscow, is leaving as a result of misunderstandings	294
108 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 401	" 1	Nationalist representatives abroad. Reports departure of envoys to Afghanistan, Bokhara and Turkistan	295
109 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 408	" 1	Nationalists. Reports on internal political situation at Ankara (see No. 131)	296
110 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 409	" 2	Greek National Defence Committee. Reports conversation at Smyrna between Mr. Hole and a member of (see No. 129)	297
111 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 410. Conf.	" 1	Italo-Turkish Agreement. Refers to No. 96. Reports conversation regarding, with Italian High Commissioner	300
112 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 412	" 2	Near East settlement. Refers to No. 106. Conversation with Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs regarding Porte's reply to Allied proposals	301
113 Sir R. Graham (Rome) No. 390	" 4	Italo-Turkish Agreement. Refers to No. 98. Italian secretary-general attempts to defend Italian action in a conversation with Sir R. Graham	302
113a Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 1111	" 6	French protectorate over Catholics in the East. Refers to No. 78. Italian Ambassador is to address note to French Government on similar lines as British note (see No. 125a)	304*
114 Mr. Lindley (Athens) No. 209	Apr. 23	Greece-Turkish conflict. Transmits military attaché's despatch on the military situation in Asia Minor	304
115 Mr. Lindley (Athens) No. 219	" 29	Near East settlement. M. Gounaris and peers opposed to evacuation of Asia Minor	305
116 To Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 1405	May 10	Near East settlement. Summarises situation and desires to learn attitude of French Government towards Turkish reply (see Nos. 117 and 129)	307
117 Sir E. Crowe (Memorandum)	" 11	Near East settlement. Refers to No. 116. Conversation with French Ambassador regarding	309
118 Italian M.F.A.	" 8	Italo-Turkish Agreement. Refers to No. 98. Gives reasons of Italian Government for concluding agreement	310
119 Mr. Lindley (Athens) No. 224	Apr. 29	Greek army in Asia Minor. Unlikely to act independently of Athens Government. General Papoulas's dissent	313
120 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 415	May 3	Atrocities by Greeks. Ankara Government's complaints regarding (see Nos. 125, 133 and 138)	314
121 Mr. Lindley (Athens) No. 232	" 6	Near East settlement. Attitude of Greek Government in view of Kemalist refusal of Allied armistice proposals	317
122 Mr. Lindley (Athens) No. 238	" 6	Atrocities by Greeks. Transmits Greek note repudiating Kemalist accusations	318
123 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 428	" 9	Atrocities by Greeks. Refers to No. 120. Transmits Ankara note regarding alleged fresh atrocities	319

No. and Name.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
124 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 431	1922 May 2	Standard Oil Company's tanks. Transmits identic note to Turkish Government protesting against erection of tanks by Standard Oil Company at Kurutehasné and Scutari (see No. 161)	319
125 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 432	" 2	Ecumenical Patriarch. Dangerous political activities of	321
125a Sir M. Cheetham (Paris) No. 1163	" 12	French protectorate over Catholics in Near East. Refers to No. 113a. Transmits Italian note to French Government regarding	322*
126 Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 1177	" 13	Near East settlement. Refers to No. 116. Transmits note from M. Poincaré stating French attitude towards (see Nos. 141 and 147)	323
127 Sir A. Gibbs (Washington) No. 547. Conf.	" 11	American interests. Refers to No. 60. Reports conversation with United States Secretary of State (see No. 155)	324
128 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 437	" 11	Italo-Turkish Agreement. Transmits copies of notes exchanged between Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs and Italian High Commissioner. Refers to No. 98	325
129 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 442	" 13	Greek National Defence Committee. Transmits Smyrna despatch No. 28 regarding Miso-Asiatic movement. Refers to No. 110	326
130 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 444	" 15	Japan and the Near East. Reports conversation with Japanese High Commissioner, who gave information about relations of Soviet Government with Ankara	329
131 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 446	" 16	Nationalists. Refers to No. 109. Internal situation at Ankara. Mustapha Kemal Pasha's relations with the Assembly	329
132 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 453	" 17	Public Debt Council. Javid Bey elected Turkish delegate on. French intrigues to secure election	330
133 French Ambassador...	" 21	Atrocities by Greeks. Refers to Turkish protests against alleged Greek atrocities. Refers to No. 120, and suggests joint protest to Greek Government	331
134 Mr. Lindley (Athens) No. 255	" 21	Greece-Turkish conflict. General report on situation, suggesting alternative course of action by His Majesty's Government	332
135 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 462	" 27	Juridical Commission. Transmits minutes of commission's examination of Treaty of Sèvres	333
136 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 465	" 28	Turkish massacres and persecution of minorities. Miss Billings's denial of report of massacres not considered trustworthy	344
137 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 469	" 24	Turkish persecution of minorities. Effect in Constantinople of strong line taken by His Majesty's Government regarding	344
138 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 471	" 23	Atrocities by Greeks. Refers to No. 120. Sir H. Rumbold considers Turkish statement inaccurate and exaggerated	346
139 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 490. Conf.	" 30	Turkish persecution of minorities. Position at Trebizond described by Dr. Gibbons. American attitude	347
140 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 493 (8973)	" 30	Greece-Turkish conflict. Experiences of Dr. Gibbons on visit to Greek front in Asia Minor	348

No. and Name.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page.
141 To Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 1720	1922 June 7	Near East settlement. Replies to M. Poincaré's note in No. 120 (see No. 147) ...	320
142 D.M.O. ...	" 8	Greek evacuation of Asia Minor. Transmits account of interview with Greek High Commissioner at Smyrna (see No. 143) ...	331
143 Mr. Lindsay (Athens) No. 379	" 1	Greek-Turkish conflict. Refers to No. 142. Discusses difficult position of Greek Government ...	355
144 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 498	" 2	Turkish persecution of minorities. Evidence of, in conversation with American Near East Relief workers ...	356
145 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 511, Conf.	" 6	Colonel Mough's mission to Angora. French High Commissioner's views on ...	357
146 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 512	" 6	Greek evacuation of Asia Minor. Meeting of Allied Mixed Committee on Refugee problems in the event of ...	358
147 Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 1385	" 10	Near East settlement. Refers to No. 126. Transmits note to M. Poincaré enclosing No. 141 (see No. 132) ...	359
148 Lt.-Col. Evelynson ...	" 11	Constantinople. Note on situation at ...	360
149 D.M.O. and I Secret	" 11	Greek-Turkish conflict. Transmits report by British military representative at Smyrna giving views of General Palis and M. Sterghiades ...	362
150 Sir A. Goshes (Washington) No. 567	" 3	Turkish persecution of minorities. Transmits reply of United States Government to proposal to institute joint Committee of Investigation ...	367
151 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 521	" 10	Standard Oil Company's tanks. Refers to No. 124. Transmits note from United States High Commissioner contesting right of Allies to protest to Turkish Government ...	368
152 Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 1437	" 17	Near East settlement. Refers to No. 147. French Government's reply to British note regarding proposals for a settlement ...	370
153 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 534	" 13	Provisional Financial Commission of Control. Transmits Sir Adam Black's report of the activities of, 1921-22 ...	372
154 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 535	" 17	Provisional Financial Commission of Control. Transmits letter from, describing situation of Turkish Treasury in June 1922 (see No. 162) ...	374
155 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 536, Conf.	" 12	American interests. Comments on No. 127 concerning attitude of United States High Commissioner ...	376
156 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 537	" 13	Near East settlement. Conversation with Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs ...	377
157 Sir R. Goshes (Rome) No. 553, V. Conf.	" 16	Nationalists and Russia. Italian Government have no confirmation of military offensive and defensive treaty between Angora and Soviet Government ...	377
158 Near Eastern Conference at Paris	Mar.	Allied meeting in Paris. Refers to Nos. 70 and 86. Text of resolutions as finally adopted by French and British Governments ...	378
159 Sir L. Worthington-Evans (War Office)	June 22	Bethsab army of occupation in Turkey. Transmits Sir C. Harrington's appreciation of situation ...	382

No. and Name.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page.
160 D.M.O. and I	1922 June 24	Greek National Defence Committee. Views of British military representative at Smyrna on Miso-Asiatic treatment ...	385
161 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 552, Conf.	" 19	French attitude towards Nationalists. French High Commissioner reluctant to offend Kemalists in spite of some provocation by latter ...	387
162 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 553	" 20	Provisional Financial Commission of Control. Refers to No. 154. Discusses possible methods of reorganising Turkish financial administration ...	388
163 Sir H. Rumbold (Constantinople) No. 556	" 20	Mustapha Kemal Pasha. Visit of, to Ada Bazar ...	389
164 Sir M. Choetham (Paris) No. 1433	" 22	Commission to investigate atrocities. Transmits note from M. Poincaré giving views of French Government regarding proposed commission ...	390
165 Italian M.F.A.	" 27	Tripartite Agreement. Modifications of, demanded by Italian Government as a condition of their approval of Palestine and Mesopotamia mandates ...	391

Chapter III—PALESTINE AND SYRIA, MESOPOTAMIA AND ARABIA.

166 Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 59	1922 Jan. 10	Palestine mandate. Transmits French note respecting (see No. 158) ...	393
167 Colonial Office	" 12	Treaty with Irak. Draft of treaty between His Majesty's Government and Feisal (see No. 171) ...	396
168 To Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 10, Tel.	" 12	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 160. His Majesty's Government give French Government assurances on three points raised ...	398
169 Acting Consul Graftier-Smith (Jeddah) No. 3, Tel.	" 15	Treaty with Hedjaz. Transmits message from King Hussein postponing decision on Lawrence-Abdullah Treaty (see No. 172) ...	399
170 Acting Consul Graftier-Smith (Jeddah) No. 103, Secret.	1921 Dec. 21	Jeddah reports. Transmits report for period One 11th to 31st December, 1921. Visit of Emir Ali. Indian vice-consul's visit to Mecca. Routes to Medina. Foreign commercial enterprise. General. Press. Shipping ...	399
171 To Colonial Office	1922 Jan. 19	Treaty with Irak. Refers to No. 167. Concur in draft, subject to observations on article 10 ...	403
172 To Acting Consul Graftier-Smith (Jeddah) No. 1, Tel.	" 24	Treaty with Hedjaz. Refers to No. 169. Revision is out of the question. Abdullah's visit must be postponed (see No. 175) ...	404
173 To French Ambassador	" 26	Egyptians resident in Syria. Proposal to regard them as French-protected persons. Egyptian Government cannot accept proposal ...	404
174 Major Marshall	" 20	Hadj of 1921. Transmits report on ...	404
175 Acting Consul Graftier-Smith (Jeddah) No. 9, Tel.	Feb. 1	Treaty with Hedjaz. Refers to No. 172. Has informed King Hussein, who declares he will not ratify unless altered (see Nos. 177 and 178) ...	426

No. and Name	Date	SUBJECT	Page
176 Acting Consul (Grafton-Smith) (Jeddah) No. 7. Secret	1922 Jan. 20	Jeddah reports. Transmits report for period the 1st to 20th January. Visit of King Hussein. Industrial Enterprise Company. New Taxation. Conscription. Routes to Medina. Aviation. Pilgrimage. Slave traffic. Missionaries. Coal dispute. Press. Shipping	420
177 Acting Consul (Grafton-Smith) (Jeddah) No. 16. Tel.	Feb. 20	Treaty with Hedjaz. Refers to No. 175. King Hussein's threat to abdicate. Wants instructions (see No. 179)	425
178 To Acting Consul (Grafton-Smith) (Jeddah) No. 5. Tel.	" 21	Treaty with Hedjaz. Refers to No. 175. May inform King Hussein that abdication must be settled with his own people	425
179 To Acting Consul (Grafton-Smith) (Jeddah) No. 7. Tel.	" 22	Treaty with Hedjaz. Refers to No. 177. If King Hussein abdicates it would be preferable for him to stay in at Mecca	426
180 Acting Consul (Grafton-Smith) (Jeddah) No. 12. Secret	" 10	Jeddah reports. Transmits report for period the 21st January to the 10th February. Articles in "Times," the 27th to 30th December, 1921. Firing on H.M.S. "Cornflower." Medina. Mecca. Yemen Mission. Arrivals. Press. Fever epidemic. Shipping	426
181 Colonial Office	Mar. 8	Boundaries of Iraq. Comments on revision of Treaty of Sèvres in connection with, and bearing of Franco-Kemalist Agreement on the boundaries (see No. 183)	434
182 Acting Consul (Grafton-Smith) (Jeddah) No. 14. Secret	Feb. 28	Jeddah reports. Transmits report for period the 11th to 26th February. Visit of King Hussein. Yemen Mission. Pilgrimage. Aviation. General. Press. Pilgrims tariff. Shipping	439
183 To Colonial Office	Mar. 17	Boundaries of Iraq. Refers to No. 181. When Treaty of Sèvres comes up for revision, recommendations will be borne in mind	444
184 Acting Consul (Grafton-Smith) (Jeddah) No. 19. Secret	" 10	Jeddah reports. Transmits report for period the 1st to 10th March. King Hussein's return to Mecca. Aviation. Medina. Mecca. General. Hashimite flag. Press. Shipping	445
185 United States Ambassador	Apr. 5	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 89 of Part IX. In view of assurances, United States Government suggest negotiation of a treaty embodying, upon appropriate conditions, the consent of the United States to the terms of the draft mandate (see No. 195)	448
186 To Count de Salis (Vatican Mission) No. 90	" 8	Palestine mandate. Enquires as to a memorandum regarding the mandate stated to have been sent by the Vatican authorities to the Council of the League of Nations (see No. 189)	451
187 To Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 13. Tel.	" 13	Treaty with Hedjaz. He may agree to suppression of latter half of article 5 if it will ensure ratification of treaty	451
188 Colonial Office	" 13	Hadj of 1922. Enquire as to continuance of exclusion of Nejd pilgrims (see No. 196)	451
189 Count de Salis (Vatican Mission) No. 90	" 13	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 186. Transmits Vatican memorandum criticising the draft mandate (see Nos. 191 and 200)	451
190 Acting Consul (Grafton-Smith) (Jeddah) No. 23. Secret	Mar. 31	Jeddah reports. Transmits report for period the 11th to 31st March. Visit of King Hussein. Quarantine. Palestine War in London. Aviation. Medina. Pilgrimage. Slave trade. General Press. Shipping	454

No. and Name	Date	SUBJECT	Page
191 Count de Salis (Vatican Mission) No. 16. Tel.	1922 Apr. 15	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 189. Note has not been sent to League of Nations yet (see No. 197)	460
192 Consul-General Satow (Beirut) No. 54	" 11	Syria. Director of the Interior of the Grand Lihai has been murdered. Crime is political	460
193 Sir P. Cox (Bagdad) to Colonial Office Tel.	" 20	Hadj of 1922. As to Nejd taking part in. Refers to No. 188 (see Nos. 194 and 213)	461
194 Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 29. Tel.	" 29	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 193. King Hussein says Nejd may come to pilgrimage by sea (see No. 213)	461
195 To United States Ambassador	" 29	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 185. His Majesty's Government accept proposals of United States Government. Suggest that article 28 should be modified. Desire to communicate correspondence to League of Nations	463
196 Admiralty	" 28	Slave traffic in the Hedjaz. Transmits reports on (see Nos. 202, 203 and 215)	462
197 Count de Salis (Vatican Mission) No. 17. Tel.	" 21	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 191. Further Vatican note is being drawn up. Memorandum being sent to League of Nations (see No. 200)	465
198 To Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 160. Tel. To Sir R. Graham (Rome) No. 134. Tel.	May 4	Palestine mandate. Agreement practically reached with United States Government. To inform Government question will be raised before Council on the 11th May, and to ask for support for British representative (see Nos. 207 and 209)	465
199 Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 29. Secret	Apr. 30	Jeddah reports. Transmits report for period the 1st to 20th April. Pilgrimage. Hashimite steamers. Aviation. General. Press. Shipping	465
200 To Count de Salis (Vatican Mission) No. 10. Tel.	May 8	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 197. Cannot understand grounds for Vatican's intervention (see No. 200)	468
201 Consul-General Satow (Beirut) No. 61	Apr. 29	Syria. Constitutional developments. Nothing done as yet to carry out scheme of federation. Reports position in the various States	468
202 To Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 30	May 9	Slave traffic in the Hedjaz. Refers to No. 196. His Majesty's Government cannot enter into treaty relations with a country where such traffic exists (see Nos. 203 and 202)	473
203 To Colonial Office	" 9	Slave traffic in the Hedjaz. Transmits copy of No. 202	473
204 French Ambassador	" 9	Palestine mandate. The Vatican desire that the League of Nations may postpone the nomination of the president of the Holy Places Commission. French Government will propose postponement of nomination at next meeting of the Council (see No. 281)	474
205 Consul London (Geneva) No. 6. Tel.	" 10	Palestine mandate. Will probably come before Council of League of Nations in a few days (see No. 208)	475
206 United States Ambassador	" 10	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 195. Terms of modification which United States Government would prefer in article 8. United States Government hope correspondence will not be laid before League of Nations until it can be made public in the United States (see Nos. 208 and 222)	475

No. and Name.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page.
207 Sir R. Graham (Rome) No. 153. Tel.	1922 May 10	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 198. Italian delegate to League of Nations is being instructed in sense desired (see Nos. 212 and 217) ...	476
208 To Consul London (Geneva) No. 13. Tel.	" 11	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 205. Informa of No. 206 ...	476
209 Sir M. Chastanet (Paris) No. 1148	" 11	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 198. Transmits note from Minister for Foreign Affairs adverse to proposal (see No. 221) ...	477
210 Consul London (Geneva) No. 8. Tel.	" 11	Palestine mandate. Proposal to place question on agenda of Council of League has been adjourned (see Nos. 211, 212 and 216) ...	478
211 Mr. Gregory (Geneva) No. 181. Tel.	" 12	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 204. Italian delegate has been asked to discuss question with the British delegate ...	478
212 To Consul London (Geneva) No. 16. Tel.	" 12	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 210. Informa of No. 207 ...	478
213 To Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 17. Tel.	" 12	Hadj of 1922. To report No. 94 to Bagdad. To inform King Hussein of No. 198 (see No. 223) ...	478
214 U.S. Embassy	" 10	Palestine mandate. Arrangement proposed to be issued by United States Government on the 11th May (see No. 221) ...	479
215 Mr. Churchill (Colonial Office) to Political Resident, Aden Tel.	" 11	Slave traffic in the Hedjaz. Refers to No. 196. What is nationality of slaves implicated? (see No. 218) ...	480
216 Consul London (Geneva) No. 10. Tel.	" 12	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 210. French will not agree to approval of mandate at present session of Council. Evidence of Vatican intrigue. Further discussion postponed ...	480
217 To Sir R. Graham (Rome) No. 144. Tel.	" 13	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 207. Were instructions sent as promised? (see No. 219) ...	481
218 To Mr. Gregory (Geneva) No. 110. Tel.	" 12	Palestine mandate. Most important that Council of League should approve during present session. Personal representation to Signor Schanzer is desirable (see No. 220) ...	481
219 Sir R. Graham (Rome) No. 184. Tel.	" 14	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 217. Is enquiring (see No. 221) ...	481
220 Mr. Gregory (Geneva) No. 192. Tel.	" 15	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 218. Nothing can be done with French Government in absence of president of the Council ...	481
221 To Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 1472	" 14	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 209. Replies to French objections (see No. 226) ...	482
222 To United States Ambassador	" 16	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 206. His Majesty's Government agree to proposed modification of article 8 and suggest addition ...	483
223 To United States Embassy	" 16	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 211. His Majesty's Government have no objection to publication of announcement ...	483

No. and Name.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page.
224 Sir R. Graham (Rome) Tel.	1922 May 16	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 219. Opposition appears to arise from Minister for Foreign Affairs now at Geneva ...	483
225 Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 32. Tel.	" 22	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 213. King Hussein refuses to accept Nejd pilgrims by land (see Nos. 232 and 251) ...	484
226 Sir P. Cox (Bagdad) to Mr. Churchill Tel.	" 23	Hadj of 1922. Owing to unrest in Hedjaz, Faisal asks that Ibn Saud may be urged to stop Nejd from going on pilgrimage ...	484
227 Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 33. Secret	" 10	Jeddah reports. Transmits report for period the 21st April to the 10th May. Pilgrimage. Flashmote steamers. Demonstrations in Mecca and Jeddah. General. Press. Shipping ...	485
228 Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 1250	" 25	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 221. Transmits note from French Government. Discussion of mandate has been postponed till next session of Council of League of Nations ...	486
229 To French Ambassador and to Italian Chargé d'Affaires	" 27	Slave traffic in the Hedjaz. Asks that local authorities in French Somaliland and in Eritrea may be instructed to watch shipping carefully ...	486
230 Count de Salla (Vatican Mission) No. 89	" 25	Palestine mandate. Refers to No. 200. Transmits note from Vatican. Holy See does not call mandate in question, but considers certain articles deserve amendment ...	489
231 To Colonial Office	" 29	Hadj of 1922. Precise meaning of " mudayyanism " ...	492
232 To Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 23. Tel.	" 31	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 225. Further representations to Ibn Saud would be useless at present (see No. 237) ...	492
233 To Count de Salla (Vatican Mission) No. 13. Tel.	" 31	Palestine mandate. Desires his presence in London ...	492
234 League of Nations (Communicated)	" 27	Palestine mandate. Translation of note from Cardinal Secretary of State ...	492
235 To Sir A. Goshen (Washington) No. 300. Tel.	June 1	Mandate for Syria. To do all he can to expedite agreement between France and United States. Bearing on Palestine mandate (see No. 251) ...	494
236 To Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 189. Tel.	" 2	Mandate for Syria. To do all he can to expedite agreement between France and United States. Question blocking Palestine mandate (see No. 238) ...	494
237 Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 36. Tel.	" 3	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 235. King Hussein still opposes the Nejd pilgrims (see Nos. 240 and 243) ...	495
238 Lord Hardinge (Paris) No. 302. Tel.	" 3	Mandate for Syria. Refers to No. 236. Instructions have been acted on ...	495
239 Sir P. Cox (Bagdad) to Mr. Churchill No. 390. Tel.	" 4	Hadj of 1922. Ibn Saud complains of attack on inhabitants of Tarabeh by a force sent by King Hussein (see No. 250) ...	495
240 Sir P. Cox (Bagdad) to Mr. Churchill No. 391. Tel.	" 4	Hadj of 1922. Faisal is very perturbed at alleged activities of Ibn Saud. Suggests that Ibn Saud be asked to reduce the Nejd pilgrims to a minimum (see Nos. 241 and 242) ...	496

No. and Name.	Date	SUBJECT.	Page.
241 Mr. Churchill to Sir P. Cox (Bagdad) No. 314. Tel.	1922 June 2	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 240. Concurs in message to Ibn Saud (see No. 236)	497
242 Sir P. Cox (Bagdad) to Mr. Churchill No. 394. Tel.	" 2	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 240. Honoured expedition against Yemen is denied	497
243 To Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 24. Tel.	" 5	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 237. Influence of No. 241 (see No. 254)	497
244 Italian Chargé d'Affaires	May 31	Slave traffic in the Hedjaz. Italian Government have issued necessary instructions	497
245 French Chargé d'Affaires	June 6	Mandate for Syria. Transmits draft of mandate and draft of treaty between France and United States (see No. 270)	498
246 Sir P. Cox (Bagdad) to Mr. Churchill Tel.	" 5	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 241. Calls attention to effect on British interests should the Nejd pilgrims lead to hostilities (see No. 256)	500
247 Mr. Doerner (Vatican Mission) No. 24. Tel.	" 6	Palestine mandate. Count de Salis has left for London	500
248 Colonial Office	" 7	Slave traffic in the Hedjaz. Refers to No. 215. Political officer reports to file has ceased in Lirai country	502
249 "	" 8	Treaty with Iraq. Proposed alterations in draft (see No. 244)	503
250 Sir P. Cox (Bagdad) to Mr. Churchill Tel.	" 5	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 239. Jeddah reports that attack on Ghumal was in reprisal for attack on Tarshah	505
251 Sir A. Giddes (Washington) No. 261. Tel.	" 7	Mandate for Syria. Refers to No. 235. United States Government have not received any recent communication from French Government	507
252 To Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 26. Tel.	" 8	Slave traffic in the Hedjaz. Representations must be such as not to adversely affect our relations with King Hussein	507
253 To Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 27. Tel.	" 8	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 237. If Hussein agrees, Nejd might be accompanied by official from Bahrain and/or British Mission at Hedjaz (see No. 257)	508
254 To Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 28. Tel.	" 8	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 243. States considerations governing attitude of His Majesty's Government in regard to King Hussein and Ibn Saud	508
255 Sir C. Hurst	" 9	Palestine mandate. Transmits draft of mandate as accepted by French Ministry for Foreign Affairs, except article 25 Mandate for Syria. Transmits draft of treaty between France and United States respecting (see No. 270)	508 509
256 Mr. Churchill to Sir P. Cox (Bagdad) Tel.	" 8	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 240. States considerations which govern attitude of His Majesty's Government in matter	518
257 Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 38. Tel.	" 11	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 253. Warning given to Hussein about Nejd pilgrims. He agreed to them coming on certain conditions (see No. 258)	519
258 Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 39. Tel.	" 11	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 257. Should Hussein resign or leave, Mecca Government will not accompany him	519

No. and Name.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page.
259	1922 June 15	Treaty with Iraq. Draft of	519
260 Colonial Office	" 14	Palestine mandate. Concur in terms of proposed reply to French Government	522
261 Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 38.	May 22	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 225. Spread of the Madayyana will render the country unsafe for foreign pilgrims (see No. 271)	522
262 Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 45	" 25	Slave traffic in the Hedjaz. Refers to No. 202. Unable to expel King Hussein to condemn domestic slavery. Wants authority to use discretion in carrying out instructions	523
263 Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 47. Secret	" 31	Jeddah reports. Transmits report for period the 11th to 31st May. Mulayyana in Hedjaz. Quarantine. General. Press. Shipping	523
264 To Colonial Office	June 15	Treaty with Iraq. Refers to No. 249. Concurs in proposed modifications. Suggest amendments in proposed telegrams to Sir P. Cox	527
265 To French Ambassador	" 16	Palestine mandate. Treaty between His Majesty's Government and United States Government cannot be signed until League of Nations settle the mandate	528
266 To Sir A. Giddes (Washington) No. 267	" 20	Palestine mandate. Transmits draft of proposed treaty for consideration of United States Government (see No. 279)	528
267 To Sir G. Grahame (Brussels) No. 530	" 20	Palestine mandate. To communicate to M. Ryssens a copy of the proposed treaty between His Majesty's Government and the United States Government	530
268 To Japanese Ambassador	" 20	Palestine mandate. Modifications in final draft. His Majesty's Government hope Japanese delegate will afford support in obtaining approval of Council of League of Nations	530
269 To Italian Ambassador	" 20	Palestine mandate. Modifications in final draft. His Majesty's Government hope Italian delegate will afford support in obtaining approval of Council of League of Nations	531
270 To French Ambassador	" 20	Palestine and Syria mandates. Refers to Nos. 245 and 255. His Majesty's Government confirm agreement. Mandate for Iraq is not completed yet	532
271 To Major Marshall (Jeddah) No. 72	" 21	Hadj of 1922. Refers to No. 201. Reviews situation in connection with Nejd pilgrims. Reasons for attitude of non-intervention by His Majesty's Government	533
272 Sir J. Tilley (Rio de Janeiro) No. 90. Tel.	" 21	Palestine mandate. M. Wilenski has arrived (see No. 278)	534
273 Mr. Doerner (Vatican Mission) No. 29. Tel.	" 24	Palestine mandate. French proposal with regard to Holy Places Commission (see No. 277)	534
274 Sir R. Graham (Rome) No. 375	" 21	Palestine and Syria mandates. Fascists Party have published their opposition to mandates	535
275 Belgian Ambassador	" 23	Palestine mandate. Asks to be informed of the negotiations between His Majesty's Government and the Vatican	536
276 Colonial Office	" 27	Hadj of 1922. Transmits copy of telegram from Sir P. Cox to Ibn Saud urging him to reduce the numbers and to firmly control the Nejd pilgrims	536

affairs of what had been her Transcaucasian provinces, or to give these provinces any protection. These border regions, therefore, were compelled to shift for themselves, and a period of more strictly Transcaucasian history thus began.

Transcaucasia a Gateway to Western and Central Asia

Geographical position and the distribution assumed by masses of land and water in South Western Asia have had much to do with the course taken by events in Transcaucasia. Through Transcaucasia run the great natural routes connecting the Black Sea and therefore the outer oceans of the world with the vast inland regions of Asia. Following these routes are railway lines, from Batoum on the Black Sea into Northern Persia, to the Caspian Sea, and also into Russia. The Caspian itself affords remarkable facilities for water communication between Transcaucasia and Northern Persia, and, by the Volga, with the interior of Russia-in-Europe. The Transcaucasian railway, extending eastward from Krasnovodsk, on the further shore of the Caspian, as far as the Pamirs brings Central Asia into easy communication with Transcaucasia and the Black Sea. Through Transcaucasia therefore lie the routes which all must follow who seek those inland regions of Asia, whether in commerce or for military purposes.

Economic Influence of the Baku Oilfield

Another important factor in the making of recent Transcaucasian history has been the existence of great deposits of oil near Baku. Ease of communication by the Caspian and the Volga has made Baku the ready and indispensable source of oil supply for the greater part of Russia. Baku, in addition, sends its oil all round the Caspian. By pipeline it goes also to Batoum whence it is shipped to various parts of the world. So great is Russia's dependence on the oil of Baku that her economic life could be strangled at will by any Power holding the oilfield. With Baku under one Government and Batoum under another the commerce of Baku with the Western world could be cut off. It is apparent therefore that Transcaucasia forms an economic unit in itself but knit to Russia by common economic interests in the closest way, and to Europe and the outer world by similar if less important ties.

Ethnic and Religious Influences

Though geographically and economically Transcaucasia constitutes an almost indivisible unit, yet ethnic and religious influences work strongly towards subdivision and disunion. The Transcaucasian peoples, who differ, but in faith. These are Georgians, of the Georgian Orthodox Church, Armenians, of the Armenian Church, Azerbaijanis, of the Sunni rite, Anatolian Turks of the Sunni rite; Adjarians, a Laz tribe of Sunni Moslems, and Russian settlers generally of the Greek Orthodox Church.

Distribution of Races.

The distribution of these races also makes for disunion. Georgians are compactly settled in the west and hold the Black Sea coast except around Batoum, which is the Adjarian country. Armenians are found chiefly in the north west and south, towards the Turkish and Persian frontiers. Tatars occupy the south-east including Baku and the Caspian coastline. In the north-east are the Daghestanis, holding another portion of the Caspian littoral, and going up into the eastern part of the Caucasian Mountains. Between the Georgians and Adjarians, and the Armenians, is an area, round about Kara and Ardahan, in which Anatolian Turks predominate. And between Armenia and Azeri is a narrow strip of land, the Nakhichevan, where Armenians and Tatars are separated from the main body of their compatriots by intervening areas occupied by the Turks. Of the Transcaucasian people Armenians are the most widely dispersed, for almost as many live outside the recognised Armenian Districts of Erivan and Kara as within them. In fact if Turkish Armenia be taken into account Erivan and Kara contain only a minority of the race. The Russians are somewhat scattered but the greater number are in Baku, Batoum, and the Georgian region.

Sub-divisions of Transcaucasia under Russian Administration

Under Russian administration the main sub-divisions of Transcaucasia were the Governments of Kutais and Tiflis, and the Province of Batoum, the two former containing chiefly a Georgian population, the Province of Baku, and the Province of Erivan, and Province of Kara, peopled by Armenians and an

important minority of Anatolian Turks. The Governments of Erevanopol and Baku, and the District of Zakataly in all of which Tatars predominate, and the Province of Daghestan, occupied by Daghestanis.

National Consciousness of the Transcaucasian Peoples

Of these various Transcaucasian races, Georgians and Armenians alone possess a national consciousness and national traditions. An independent Georgia existed until the year 1801, when the country was absorbed by Russia in violation of her covenants. Armenian independence has a much older tradition for every form of Armenian independence in this region came to an end during the 11th century but the Armenian people exhibit, notwithstanding, a stronger national consciousness than any other race in Transcaucasia. The Tatars have no national traditions. The area which they occupy the Governments of Erevanopol and Baku, formed part of the Persian Province of Azerbaijan until the year 1813, when the province was divided and the northern portion ceded to Russia. The Daghestanis have, as yet, scarcely attained to more than tribal ambitions, except for a certain community with other Moslem peoples.

Influences operating against Transcaucasian Unity

Between these several peoples, but more particularly between Armenians and Moslems, exist racial and religious hatreds which present almost insuperable difficulties to the growth of Transcaucasian unity. These animosities have been given a wider and deeper importance by two or perhaps three active and powerful political movements. The first is the movement for the Armenian national society known as the Dashnaksutun, sought to obtain Armenian autonomy, or perhaps, complete independence of Russia, by methods of violence and revolution. The second and third are the pan-Islamic and pan-Turanian movements which have been supported and pushed by the "Young Turk" Government of Turkey with every method of intrigue and violence. The aims of the pan-Islamic movement in particular—much more dangerous than the academic ideas of pan-Turanianism—sought to unite all Moslem peoples, from the Balkans to Central Asia, into one great religious and political confederation of Moslem States under the leadership of Turkey. Transcaucasian Moslems, more especially the Tatars, have displayed considerable passive and even active sympathy for these movements. Between the various Transcaucasian peoples there are, in addition, conflicting economic interests of the acutest kind.

The influences making for disunion are, in fact, so deep-seated and powerful that nothing less than control by an external power can enforce a permanent working unity among the bickering peoples. Such necessary control was exerted by Russia until her collapse in 1917.

From the conditions so outlined it appears, that if free from external compulsion, the tendency of Transcaucasia is to break into at least three parts, corresponding roughly with the areas occupied by the three chief races—to the formation, in fact, of the independent states of Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia.

Problems before the Transcaucasian Peoples on the Collapse of Russia.

It was under these circumstances of geographic, strategic and economic position, and racial relations, that the collapse of Russia threw the Transcaucasian provinces on their own resources, at a time, too, when the issue of the war was still undecided. The Transcaucasian peoples were thus left to their own devices, and should be on the basis of Transcaucasian unity or on the basis of separate states. Supposing the choice to be for independence of any kind, then they must determine the form of government, and the extent of their own defence. Transcaucasia formed the battle front of Russia, and when Russian armies were dissolving the snow Transcaucasia, whether Russian or independent stood to be overrun by Turkish armies. The Transcaucasian provinces hope for much aid from the Western enemies of Turkey. To these Transcaucasia was practically inaccessible, and the aid was attended by many difficulties and the most serious limitations.

CHAPTER II—The Transcaucasian Federal Republic

the declaration of the Republic on September 20, 1917, to the dissolution of the Republic on
March 20, 1918.

July 1917. Action by Transcaucasian Members of the Russian Duma

During the spring and summer of 1917 events in Russia clearly portended the downfall of the Empire. Following the appointment of M. Kerensky to the position of Prime Minister on the 19th July, in place of Prince Lvov, the Georgian, Armenian and Tatar members of the Duma left Petrograd and hastened back to Transcaucasia, convinced that a crisis of serious import to the peoples of that region was at hand. They had already discussed the situation among themselves, and decided that a policy of independence for Transcaucasia as a whole was the only policy adequate to the emergency. But in Georgia and Armenia movements in favour of separate independence were strong. Georgia, in fact, had already presented a demand to the Duma for the restoration of her old autonomous rights. It was doubtful, therefore, how much support could be found among the Transcaucasian peoples for the action of the Duma. Informal conferences accordingly were held at Tiflis and elsewhere.

Armenians, and by some of the more enlightened Tatar Moslems. In the end, Georgians and Armenians agreed to adopt Transcaucasian independence on the views coloured by the ideas of pan-Islamism, were in general opposed to the proposed course, or even strongly hostile to it. Well-to-do Moslems as a class were, however, in favour. Propaganda, therefore, was undertaken to create, if possible, a stronger Moslem movement in support of Transcaucasian unity.

August 1917. Diet of the Transcaucasian Peoples

Meanwhile, for events in Russia were moving fast, arrangements were made for electing and convoking a Diet of the Georgian, Armenian and Tatar peoples. This Diet assembled in Tiflis at the end of August 1917. On the 10th September M. Kerensky became Dictator of Russia, and on the 15th September Russia was proclaimed a republic. Transcaucasian leaders now deemed that the moment had come for them to take definite action. Avoiding the question of complete independence for the time being, the Diet, as the "Council of the Transcaucasian Peoples," declared Transcaucasia a Federal Republic on the 20th September, though, practically, the republic remained an integral part of Russia. At the same time the province of Dagestan proclaimed the independence of the province as the "Mountain

Influence of the Grand Duke Nicholas.

The Russian army on the Transcaucasian front was already far gone on the way to dissolution. The process had been hastened by an action of the Revolutionary Government. The Grand Duke Nicholas, uncle of the ex-Czar, who, by his great personal influence and popularity, had been able to hold the army together, was a Government. He was offered, and accepted the supreme command of the Russian armies, and left Transcaucasia on the 19th March 1917, to take up his new position. But the offer was no more than a lure. When safely parted from his troops he was arrested, and, though personal injury to him, or even trial, was deemed inexpedient, the country was carried on by the army commanders, with rapidly diminishing influence and efficiency.

Russian Military Policy in Transcaucasia

In addition to direct revolutionary causes a long-standing principle of Russia's military policy contributed not a little to her collapse in Transcaucasia, as on all fronts. This principle was to use the troops raised in her conquered and repressed provinces in any region but their native land. Her Georgian and Armenian troops, therefore, numbering in all nearly 300,000 men—Tatars were exempt from military service—had been sent to European fronts, and the army of the Caucasus formed of Siberians, Poles, West Russians, Finns and others. These troops had no strong

desire, under revolutionary influence, was to return to their distant homes. This further affected Georgia and Armenia prejudicially in their endeavour towards independence, for when the need for a native army arose their men of military age were elsewhere, and when the survivors did return it was as apostles of the Bolshevism which had secured their repatriation.

Later experience and the nature of the struggle had, indeed, shown the Russian military authorities the advantage of employing local troops on the Transcaucasian front, and then many thousands of Armenians were drafted or volunteered into Russian units of the army. But they formed at best only a small proportion of the Grand Duke's forces. These Armenian elements, distributed among non-Armenian units, were, however, all that could at first be expected to stand between Transcaucasia and Turkish invasion when the Russian army should have dissolved.

September 1917. Transcaucasian Delegation to the British Minister at Tehran

Before the Federal Republic was proclaimed a Transcaucasian delegation had been sent to consult the British Minister at Tehran, and thus get into communication with the British Government, and if possible, obtain their support. The outcome was that His Majesty's Government promised financial assistance to the Transcaucasian peoples provided they would organise and endeavour to defend their frontiers against the enemies of the Entente Powers. British financial boards for this purpose were to be established at Hamadan, where anti-Bolshevik Russian forces were in occupation—and at Tiflis, which would support the Armenian and other troops on the Transcaucasian western front. During these negotiations the word "Armenian" was unfortunately used in a communication to the delegation as synonymous for all the forces on that front. The Armenians were in consequence, able to make mischievous use of the promise by boasting that British support was being given to them alone and not to the Transcaucasian peoples as a whole. The effect of the misapprehension was unfortunate, persistent and far-reaching. Do what they might, British officials in Caucasus were never able to overtake and entirely destroy the unfortunate impression thus created in the minds of Georgians and Tatars.

Dissension in the Federal Diet

From the time the Diet of the Federal Republic first met it was struggling in deep waters with little hope of surviving. The three parties, Georgians, Armenians and Tatars, could agree upon no common policy, could not recognise even a common complete separation from Russia, and the full independence of Transcaucasia. Armenians desired an autonomous Transcaucasia which should retain the Russian connection considering that without Russian support the Armenian people in particular would go to the wall. The Tatars, possessing no national traditions, and steeped in pan-Islamism, not only saw no danger from the Turk but looked towards union with Turkey as a desirable future, at least for themselves.

November 1917. Effect on Transcaucasia of Lenin and Trotsky coming to Power in Russia

Matters drifted on thus into November 1917. And then, on the 8th November, came the Bolshevik coup d'état in Petrograd, which placed Lenin and Trotsky in power with all that the change might mean. Hostilities between Russia and the Central Powers were suspended on the 2nd December, the armistice of Brest-Litovsk was signed on the 15th December, and negotiations for peace were begun. With these negotiations appeared the Bolshevik formula for peace: "No indemnities, no annexations, and the free determination of peoples."

Collapse of the Russian Front against Turkey

It gave the signal for the collapse of the Russian front against Turkey. The non-Caucasian troops, shouting "No indemnities, no annexations," forsook their positions and retired behind the pre-war Russo-Turkish frontier. Here a halt was made and a partial front re-established. But not for long. Bolshevik principles and influence apart, the troops had an over-powering desire to have done with the war and regain their far-off homes. In their view the retreat was essentially a homeward movement, and they had no intention of remaining on the historic battlefields of the Transcaucasian border with the certainty or even the possibility of there renewing the struggle. That a halt was made at all was due to the devoted

efforts of the Russian officers. But disorganisation and the breakdown of military discipline had gone too far for remedy, too far for interruption, too far for the end to be long delayed.

Russian Troops entrain themselves for Home

A little later some 500,000 Russian troops of the Caucasian army between the Caucasus Mountains and the Turkish frontier were as a disorganised armed rabble struggling to entrain themselves for home by the one line of railway leading into Russia. However the Armenian elements of the army numbering something less than 40,000 men, stood fast on the abandoned Russian front in Anatolia and were able for the time being to prevent a Turkish advance.

Defection of the Tatar Delegates in the Federal Diet

As soon as the Russian army had dissolved the pan-Islamic Tatars showed their true colours. They organised a Tatar Government at Elizavetopol on the railway to Baku and Russia. From this centre, urged by German and Turkish agents, they incited the Tatar villagers and tribesmen to block the railway, dig entrenchments, and disarm the crowded train-loads of deserting Russian soldiery. Their operations were continued for several weeks with great success, and secured arms and munitions on a large scale for the Tatar population. The adroit opportunism of these Tatars was no partial or merely tribal action. Large numbers were employed, the railway line was flanked by elaborate trenches, formidable military positions, not to be easily captured, were created, and the homeward movement of the Russian troops was completely stopped. These troops, however, were in no mood to be balked. Finding their flight obstructed in this manner they at last organised themselves on a sufficient scale crushed Tatar opposition, and restored the railway.

Efforts to create a Transcaucasian Army

With the dissolution of the Russian army, and while these Russo-Tatar hostilities were in progress, the Georgian and Armenian members of the Diet and what remained of the Russian General Staff endeavoured to organise a force sufficient to hold the front against the Turks. The Armenian elements who had remained in their positions were inadequate to the defence. Additional units, therefore, were enlisted of Armenians, Georgians, Assyrians, Russian volunteers of all, in fact, who could be persuaded to take arms against the threatened Turkish invasion. The British Military Mission at Tiflis, under Colonel Pike, gave assistance and offered to finance and control the enterprise. Equipment was collected, a new Armenian division formed, and agents were sent out to raise the Assyrians of Urmia and North Persia. Preparations were also begun in Mesopotamia for despatching 350 British officers via Baku to the Caucasian front to organise and lead the army now being formed.

Bolshevik Sympathies of Returning Georgian Troops

Much was hoped for too from the Georgian troops who were at this time returning from the European front. But they proved to be steeped in Bolshevik theories, and refused to defend any front not actually on Georgian soil, nor would they take any orders which had not previously received the sanction of their committees. They advocated a policy of peace with Germany and Turkey forthwith if necessary at the expense of the Armenians.

Animosity of Armenian Troops against Moslems of the Federal Republic

If the attitude of these Georgians did not make for Transcaucasian unity, still less did the actions of the newly enlisted Armenian troops. Their hatred was directed against Moslems, and they could allow no opportunity for paying off old scores to pass, even against their Moslem fellow citizens of the Federal Republic. Instead, therefore, of proceeding to the positions assigned them on the front these Armenians, reckless of considerations of unity, at first occupied themselves with massacring and exterminating the Tatars within reach. The Tatars retaliated and rose on the Persian frontier thus severing communications between Armenians of Transcaucasia and the Assyrians of Urmia who were coming to their assistance. Notwithstanding all difficulties, however, the defence of the western Transcaucasian front was sufficiently maintained to prevent a Turkish advance at the time.

January 1918. First Attempt to establish Bolshevik Control in Transcaucasia. March 1918. Bolshevik Administration established at Baku. Eviction and Massacre of Moslems at Baku.

In January 1918, the Bolshevik Government at Petrograd made an attempt to re-establish Russian control in Caucasasia by sending to Tiflis an important official, Shaimin, a Russian Armenian, Dashnak and Bolshevik, to assume the position of Chief Commissar for the Caucasus. He failed, however, to obtain a hearing either in Georgia or Armenia. Nor were his efforts to secure the abolition of the Transcaucasian Diet more successful. Hostility to him and to the purpose of his mission became so strong at last that in March he was compelled to flee from Tiflis disguised as a private soldier. He succeeded in reaching Baku, where, with the aid of the Armenian Dashnakist Society, whose policy at that time was to seek Russian support as necessary to any form of Armenian independence, he was able to set up a Bolshevik administration. The population was aroused by this act, more particularly against the Armenians. The Tatars therefore threatened resistance. Whereupon Shaimin contrived that the Dashnak forces, numbering about 10,000 men, and the remnants of the Russian army in the town, should make common cause with the local Bolshevik elements and the Bolshevik fleet which controlled the Caspian. Agreement having been secured, the united forces evicted the Moslem inhabitants of Baku on the 14th March and massacred some 3,000 of them in the process.

March 1918. Treaty of Brest-Litovsk: its effect on Transcaucasia.

On the 3rd March 1918, Bolshevik Russia, after various delays, signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk with the Central Powers and their Allies. By this treaty Russia was compelled to cede to Turkey the three Transcaucasian districts of Ardahan, Kars and Batoum, the two former in the area claimed by Armenia, the latter in the area by Georgia. Here was a direct and pressing menace to the territorial integrity of the Transcaucasian Republic, which intensified the conflict of opinion between the Georgian, Armenian and Tatar peoples. Georgia and Armenia, bound to lose much under the treaty, but had different ideas of how to safeguard themselves. Azerbaijan stood to lose nothing and was, on the whole, in favour of the treaty.

March 1918. Turkish Offensive against the Federal Republic begins.

So far the western front maintained by the Republic had proved sufficiently strong to deter the Turks from a general offensive, though they had recaptured Trebizond on the 24th February. But with the conclusion of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk on the 3rd March, Turkish operations on a serious scale were begun with the purpose of occupying the districts awarded to Turkey under the treaty. Erzerum fell to Turkish arms on the 12th March, Sarikamish on the 4th April, and Van on the 5th April. The republic meanwhile attempted to negotiate, but these efforts proving fruitless, the Diet broke off negotiations on the 13th April, and on the 16th April the Turks occupied Batoum. By this time the republic had become little more than a name. The Diet itself was split upon racial lines. No force capable of offering effective resistance to the Turkish invasion could be got together. By the action of the Armenians and Bolsheviks the Mohammedan elements in all Transcaucasia had been alienated beyond hope of recovery, and at least in sympathies, had gone over to the Turko-German side. The Georgians were at loggerheads with the Armenians owing to the continued intrigues and association of the latter with the Russians, both revolutionary and reactionary. In fact the Armenians in Baku had joined hands with the Bolsheviks while the Armenian army in Erivan and the west still regarded itself as under the orders of the reactionary party in Russia. Racial hatred ran higher than ever, and civil war appeared inevitable.

April 1918. Declaration of Independence by the Federal Republic.

Amid these distractions the Diet on the 22nd April, declared the independence of the republic in a vain attempt to place the country outside the operation of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. At the same time the Diet resolved to reopen negotiations with the Turks, claiming that Transcaucasia was now an independent State in fact, if not in law. These measures, too, were unavailing, and the occupation of Caucasian territory by Turkish troops continued. Batoum was captured on the 16th April, Kars on the 27th April, and Alexandropol on the 14th May.

On the 8th May, German and Turkish troops entered the city and he
negotiated peace with the Georgians. A treaty was signed on 10th May, 1918,
which provided a treaty of peace between the German and Turkish
armies and the Georgian people. The treaty was signed in Tiflis, Georgia,
and provided for the withdrawal of German and Turkish troops from the
city and the restoration of peace to the region. The treaty was a significant
achievement for the German and Turkish forces, as it marked the end of
their military operations in the Caucasus region.

On the 4th August, a small body of British troops, the advance party of General Dunsterville's force, arrived at Baku from Mesopotamia, via Persia and the Caspian. As previously mentioned, the original intention had been to send a military mission of 350 British officers to organize and lead the Armenian-Russian-Assyrian force on the Transcaucasian western front. But this plan became impossible of execution, and a small military expedition—the strength of which never reached 1,000 men—was sent instead to assist the "Central Caspian Division." Its officers and soldiers were placed upon various Caspian steam vessels, which they armed, and thus provided a sufficient naval force. The expedition, however, was in a precarious position. Only the German occupation

of Georgia, by compelling the Turks to use the difficult route across Armenia, had made it possible for General Dunsterville's force to occupy Baku.

September 1918. The British evacuate Baku.

During the first week in September the Turkish troops outside Baku received their long-expected reinforcements and supplies of munitions. General Dunsterville's position then became impossible, and he re-embarked his troops on the 14th and 15th September. The charge that the expedition was betrayed by the Armenians has no foundation in truth. General Dunsterville himself informed the Armenian leaders that he would be compelled to evacuate the town and urged them to accept the not unsatisfactory terms already offered by the Turkish general commanding the attacking force. The Armenians categorically refused, and continued street fighting for two days after the British had withdrawn. During this period of unavailing resistance some 15,000 Armenians of both sexes and all ages were butchered in retaliation for the massacre of Moslems in March.

CHAPTER IV - The Independent Republics under the British Occupation

From the armistice of Mudros, October 31, 1918, to the British evacuation, August 28, 1919.

October 1918. The Armistice of Mudros.

The armistice of Mudros, between the Allies and Turkey, which came into operation on the 31st October, 1918, provided for the evacuation of Transcaucasian territory by Turkish troops. The armistice of the 11th November between the Allies and Germany required a similar evacuation by German troops. Acting on behalf of the Allies a British occupation of Transcaucasia now began in order to ensure the execution of the terms of both armistices.

November 1918, Second British Occupation of Baku. December 1918, British Occupation of Batoum.

On the 17th November, 1918, therefore, a British force from North Persia, under Major General Thompson, accompanied by a force of Russian Social Revolutionary troops, under General Bicharachev, arrived by sea, and occupied Baku. On the 27th December another British force, detached from the Salonika army under General Forster Walker, occupied Batoum. The Salonika force eventually occupied Georgia and made its headquarters at Tiflis. This force was under the War Office, many of its officers, too, had been attached to General Denikin's staff. The Republic of Azerbaijan was occupied by troops from Mesopotamia via Baku, mainly officered from the Indian army. The whole of the troops from Mesopotamia, in fact, had originally been under the India Office.

Opposing Sympathies of the British Troops.

These two British divisions occupying Transcaucasia had, therefore, very distinct predilections and antipathies. The Salonika division disliked Moslems, preferred Christians, and sympathised with all and any Russian movement. The Mesopotamian division were said to adore Moslems and to have the traditional Anglo-Indian suspicion of everything pertaining to Russian imperialism. Between these two opposing lines of sympathy

the peoples of Transcaucasia could discover no definite British policy. Georgians found the British in Georgian territory sympathetic enough, but also strangely

or Yudenitch, to all of which the Georgian people were fiercely opposed. The Tatars of Azerbaijan, on the other hand, found the British steeped in Moslem sympathies, and regarding reactionary Russians with almost as much hostility as did the Tatars.

the strength of British support of the Armenian cause and recent British statements of policy, they were supremely confident of being the chosen Transcaucasian allies of Great Britain.

Intrigues of the French Military Mission.

The French Military Mission, under Colonel Chardigny, merely added to the confusion. The members of this mission were at the time strongly opposed to the existence of any Transcaucasian republic, whether of Transcaucasia as a whole, or

of its sub-divisions, and did their utmost to persuade the Armenians that the only hope for the future lay in supporting Russian reactionaries, and being again incorporated in an Imperial Russia. With all these cross-currents of influence breaking in upon the confusion already inherent in the internal politics of Transcaucasia, a satisfactory solution was bound to arise.

The re-organisation of Transcaucasia was begun. Little was necessary in the German occupation had left the country untouched by war, and administration was in the hands of experienced Georgians, many of whom had held high administrative posts under the Russian Government.

Conditions in Armenia.

But in Armenia conditions were nearly desperate. The country and towns along the Turkish lines of communication had been ravaged and swept of everything by Turkish troops. There was no money, little food and little clothing. To add to the difficulties of the republic its territory contained, besides the ordinary population, some 300,000 destitute Armenian refugees from Turkish provinces. Disease of every kind was rife, and the death rate abnormally high. The Government was in the hands of the Dashnakistun Party, whose chief object appeared to be revenge upon all Moslems. The leaders of the party, though advanced Socialists, were controlled by Russian reactionaries, and the Armenian army, mainly officered by Russians, styled itself "Denikin's 9th army." Co-operation between an Armenia of these sympathies and anti-Russian Georgia thus became an impossibility. British assistance in Armenia was therefore confined chiefly to relief work and to the settlement of disputes between Armenia and her neighbours.

Conditions in Azerbaijan.

In Azerbaijan difficulties were of another kind, serious enough in themselves, but impossible of solution. The Government of Azerbaijan had been removed from Elizavetopol to Baku when the Turkish occupation of that town took place, and with Turkish support it became tolerably effective. On the retirement of the Turks, however, after the armistice, the Government collapsed and left the country in chaos, and it became necessary for the British to re-establish an administration in almost every department of the country's life. There were difficulties too with the Turkish troops, for many officers and men sought to evade the armistice by enlisting in the Azerbaijan army. Martial law was proclaimed, the Turkish troops turned out, and public order maintained by British military police.

British Measures of Reconstruction in Azerbaijan.

The Russian and Azerbaijan State banks were amalgamated and worked by a British staff, and the issue of notes regulated. Food control was established, and the population placed on rations under the card system in use in England, with the result that supplies of food became abundant. A British Labour Control Office was set up to investigate and settle industrial disputes. Industry and shipping, which had been nationalised by former Socialist Governments, were now released and placed in private hands. Trade between Baku and Persia was encouraged, the Baku-Batoum pipe-line restored, and oil pumped between those towns, and, in accordance with the terms of the armistice, the whole system of transport and communications was taken over by the British. Continual quarrels regarding rolling stock and engines had occurred between the republics, it was found advisable, therefore, to set up a British railway board at Tiflis and place all the railways of Transcaucasia under their exclusive control. In fact, on almost every subject in which the interests of the republics touched, it became necessary to set up British arbitration commissions to settle questions in dispute.

Conditions in Batoum.

In the province of Batoum, which the Turks had occupied under the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, only to evacuate under the armistice of Mudros—the British adopted similar administrative measures to those taken at Baku, but a commission of Russian and native intelligentsia was appointed to settle the question of Batoum. The destiny of Batoum was the all-absorbing question during the British occupation. The town and province were claimed by Georgia, Armenia, and the Russian supporters of General Denikin. This conflict for the reversion of the province gave issue to endless intrigues and involved the British staff in much trouble and no little friction with the inhabitants, the Georgian Government and the Russian reactionaries.

British Political Aims in Transcaucasia during the Occupation

During the occupation the British authorities in Transcaucasia were in fact confined to essentials. It was sought to reconstruct and reorganise as far as might be possible to give the republics the opportunity of working out their own destiny, above all to keep the peace between the republics, and between them and the forces of General Denikin. The British authorities therefore did what they could to foster Transcaucasian federal unity as a policy for the republics to follow. But no success attended their efforts.

Armenian Attitude towards Russia

As has been stated Armenia, alone of the Transcaucasian republics, was in favour of Russian control being re-established over Transcaucasia. It would be difficult to deny that on the whole the instincts or reasons prompting the Armenians to this view were sound in the interest of the Armenian people. Armenians were at once the least numerous, the most inaccessible as to the territorial position they occupied and the most disliked race in Transcaucasia. And, further, the majority of their people were settled in Turkish territory. Russia alone of the Great Powers was able to offer Armenia and Asia Minor any effective protection. In fact the Russian occupation of Asia Minor as the ultimate and satisfactory solution of Armenian difficulties.

January 1919 War between Armenia and Georgia

Holding these views, confirmed in them by the French Military Mission, and beset with the intrigues of General Denikin to obtain active Armenian support for his movement, the Armenians, under the leadership of General Antrouk, fought a war with Georgia over the disputed territory of Borchalinsk. The war did not go far, but General Forrester Walker persuaded the hostile States to accept his arbitration, by which a neutral zone was established and peace secured.

Hostilities between Armenia and Azerbaijan

In the east too, in the bitterly disputed areas of Zangezur and Nachichevan, Armenians were in active hostility with the Tatars of Azerbaijan. The Armenian General Antrouk, who, with some 10,000 irregulars, was making a conquest of the debated territories on behalf of the Armenian Republic had got beyond the control of his Government. The general and his army refused to recognise the armistice of Mudros or indeed any armistice. Massacre and counter massacre by Armenians and Tatars had become regular features of a warfare in which every prompting of racial and religious hatred found expression.

Disbandment of General Antrouk's Force

But here again the British military authorities were able to effect a settlement. General Antrouk was persuaded by General Thompson, commanding at Baku, to disband his following in January-February 1919, as a measure of importance to Allied policy, and the disputed territories were temporarily placed under the control of British troops.

General Antrouk's force—a force which had its origin among Turkish Armenians—presented their ideals—the influence of Turkish Armenians on the policy of the Armenian republic almost disappeared. General Thompson's action in obtaining the disbandment of General Antrouk's army has remained the cause of vehement Armenian misrepresentation ever since.

The Paris Peace Conference and Transcaucasia

In 1919 the Peace Conference at Paris began to sit, and it was not long before Caucasian affairs with all their obscure, involved and dangerous implications were calling for the attention of the Supreme Council. Russia, as has been shown, dominated every Caucasian question, and the fluctuating Russian situation forbade any definite or thorough Allied policy towards Caucasasia and Caucasian independence. Allied efforts in Caucasasia were ever limited by the conviction that the re-emergence of Russia as a Great Power would mean the peremptory termination of any Allied undertakings which were in conflict with Russian interests as Russia saw them. The one reasonable hope for preserving Caucasian independence in the event of a revived Russia appearing lay in the previous creation of a strong firmly united Federal Caucasian State. But this hope was rendered impossible of realisation by internal dissensions. In their resolve to

oppose the introduction of Bolshevism, the Transcaucasian peoples were, however, at this time in complete accord. It was therefore in the Allied interest to give what support they could to a population of seven or eight millions, whether united or disunited politically, who were planted across the most important routes into Asia and resolved to bar to the utmost the advance of Bolshevism.

Allied Policy in Caucasasia and the Russian Reactionary Movement

But though welcoming Allied—or British—control for the present the Caucasian peoples desired above all else to know what policy the Allies intended to adopt towards Caucasasia if the Bolsheviks were overthrown and a reactionary Government established in Russia. Indications were not wanting that if such a development took place Caucasasia would be handed back to Russia with, at best, some form of autonomy assured by covenant. This prospect, though agreeable enough to the Allies and to Armenia, did not suit Georgia, Azerbaijan and Daghestan. The more the Supreme Council examined Transcaucasian problems the less they cared to commit themselves to definite or permanent solutions, nor did any Great Power appear anxious to undertake responsibilities in the country. The British occupation, at the request of the Allies, provided a satisfactory temporary solution, the more so that the cost was borne entirely by the British taxpayer.

British Interests and the British Occupation.—Offer of a Mandate for Transcaucasia to Italy

But British interests were not sufficiently great to warrant more than a brief continuance of this thankless responsibility. In fact, early in 1919 His Majesty's Government had decided that on financial and other grounds the occupation could not be maintained much longer. At the beginning of April the Supreme Council agreed that British troops should be withdrawn, and their place taken by Italian troops, the mandate for Transcaucasia having been offered to, and accepted in principle by the Italian Government. The proposal caused a storm of protest throughout Transcaucasia. It was urged that Italy would be unable to give effect to the mandate that she lacked alike prestige, financial resources and experience that she had no interest except exploitation, in any of the republics. Some six weeks later, however, the Italian Government definitely refused to accept the position of mandator.

July 1919 Appointment of Colonel Haskell as Allied High Commissioner for Armenia

In July 1919 the Supreme Council despatched Colonel Haskell, an American officer, to the Caucasus with the title of Allied High Commissioner for Armenia. His duties were primarily concerned with relief work, the main part of which was being carried out by the American Near East Relief Commission, but he also used his influence to prevent hostilities breaking out again between the Armenians and Tatars in the disputed territories of Nachichevan, Zangezur and Kurakhagh.

Government of United States and the Mandate for Transcaucasia.—Offer of Transcaucasian States to bear Cost of British Garrison

The Government of the United States in turn seemed disinclined to accept the position of mandator for Transcaucasia, even though the mandate might include the whole of Turkey as well. No Power now being willing to undertake the task, and the British garrison finally loaded upon the three republics of Transcaucasia offered to bear the cost if the British garrison were allowed to remain. On political grounds the United States Government found it difficult to accept this offer chiefly, it would seem, because of their belief that General Denikin's movement appeared to promise success, and British commitments to Transcaucasia would be in conflict with those to General Denikin.

Russian Anti-Bolshevik Movement in Cis-Caucasia

But it is necessary now to go back a little in point of time and give some attention to the Russian anti-Bolshevik movement which developed in Cis-Caucasia, north of the Caucasus. This movement, which began to take shape under General Denikin, contained—or seemed to contain—incalculable possibilities for the Allies, by whom it had to be treated with the utmost circumspection. Indeed, it fundamentally affected Allied policy in Transcaucasia, and the policy of each of the Transcaucasian States. The Allies saw in this movement the chief hope of Bolshevism being overthrown by Russian effort. The movement kept before their vision the prospect of a reconsti-

tuted Great Russia emerging, whose interests it would be highly impolitic for the Allies to injure in advance, a Russia too, whose immediate aim, as the Transcaucasian States well knew, would be to destroy the independence of those provinces which had detached themselves from her. The Allied policy followed therefore, was to support the anti-Bolshevik movement in Cis-Caucasia in every way short of armed assistance and at the same time to go cautiously in the matter of recognising the independence of the Transcaucasian States. These States, however, as has been said, were divided on the matter of their future position regarding Russia. Armenia desired autonomy under Russia, Azerbaijan, on the whole, looked towards Turkish protection, but was opposed to any form of Russian domination, Georgia desired complete independence and was exceedingly hostile to anything favouring a Russian recovery.

British Policy in Transcaucasia apparently Contradictory both to Russians and the Caucasian Peoples

Though disinclined to give formal recognition to the independence of the Transcaucasian States until the Russian situation should have become more clear, Great Britain, at least, recognised that these States were entitled subject to the decisions of the Peace Conference to make their own choice. Great Britain therefore sought during her occupation, to maintain peace in Transcaucasia, to give the States assistance, and an opportunity of working out their own destiny. In a way her policy appeared contradictory, both to anti-Bolshevik Russians and to the Georgians, Azerbaijanis and Armenians, who all believed that in reality she was playing for her own hand. To them she seemed to be running with the hare and hunting with the hounds. In this opinion they were confirmed by the assurances alike of German and Turkish secret agents and French and Italian military missions.

Beginning of Anti-Bolshevik Movement in Cis-Caucasia

The anti-Bolshevik movement in Cis-Caucasia, which gave rise to all these complications began as far back as November 1917, when General Alexeeff undertook to organise a volunteer army in the Kuban Province. The army grew rapidly in spite of varying fortune, and at the end of 1918 had reached a strength of about 140,000 men. It was regarded as forming the European wing of Admiral Kolchak's great anti-Bolshevik operations, and as such received lavish Allied support in armaments and military stores.

General Denikin assumes Supreme Command of Anti-Bolshevik Forces in South-East Russia

In January 1919 General Denikin assumed supreme command of all Russian anti-Bolshevik forces from the Don to the Caucasus Mountains. Admiral Kolchak too, at this time, voluntarily placed himself under General Denikin's orders. The headquarters of the army were at Ekaterinodar in the Province of Kuban, and its chief port was Novorossiisk, on the Black Sea. The volunteer army at this period held two fronts against the enemy, the Don front in the north, and the Cis-Caucasian front in the south-east. Ignoring the Don front the general in the middle of January began a strong offensive on his Cis-Caucasian front.

His troops first moved on to Stavropol and then at Vladikavkaz, and captured over 30,000 prisoners and occupied the city. On 10th February they moved on to Tiflis, and on 16th March defeated the Bolsheviks. A few days later his troops reached the Caspian Sea at Petrovsk in the Province of Daghestan.

General Denikin and Huku

As soon as this offensive of General Denikin's began it was evident that his real aim was to reach Baku, and to establish a permanent base of operations there. This aim was in complete accordance with British policy, and even with British undertakings. For the Mahomedan Province of Daghestan, which had formed the "North Caucasian Republic" or the "Mountain Republic"—since May 1917, had been more or less unofficially recognised by the British military authorities at Baku after the armistice. In January 1919 the British military authorities at Baku had decided to evacuate the Caucasus from the Black Sea to Daghestan, and thence by the northern frontier to the Caspian Sea, and to place the whole of the North Caucasian Republic were thus placed out of bounds to General Denikin.

General Denikin violates the Line of Demarcation

But with his enemy on the run the general was not to be deterred by what, at first, he regarded as a merely temporary arrangement. After his success at Mosdak on the 3rd February, Petrovsk, the capital of the Daghestan and an important port on the Caspian, lay not far away, and open to seizure by his troops. The general therefore, anxious only to gather the fruits of his successes, pushed on, ignored the agreed line, and occupied the capital and the northern part of Daghestan. The republic, of course, protested against this violation, but it was not in the power of His Majesty's Government to insist on the withdrawal of the Volunteer army; nor, perhaps, would that course have been politic. Acting on instructions from London, therefore, General Thompson, in June 1919, revised the line of demarcation by bringing its eastern part five miles south of Petrovsk. General Denikin was thus confirmed in his occupation of Petrovsk, which provided him with a port on the Caspian and assured him possession of the line of railway between Petrovsk and his northern front on the Don. Having secured these advantages, it was supposed that he would be less anxious to reach Baku.

Georgian and Azerbaijan Intrigues in Daghestan

But Georgia and Azerbaijan took alarm at this encroachment on the North Caucasian Republic. The violence offered it at the hands of General Denikin and his Volunteer army, notwithstanding British promises, might well, they argued, happen to themselves. Both Governments, too, were anxious that Daghestan should be independent of any present or future Russia, they therefore took secret measures for stirring up opposition to General Denikin in Daghestan.

Raiding in Daghestan—The whole of Daghestan placed under Control of General Denikin

Conditions in the republic were already favourable for the creation of trouble. Ever since the armistice the country had become the centre of German and Turkish activities. Nuri Pasha, brother of Enver Pasha, and lately the Turkish Commander-in-Chief—who had already escaped from British captivity at Batumi, was known to be in the country.

General Denikin soon had to deal with small sporadic outbreaks by the tribesmen and with persistent interruption of his communications. To suppress these activities and to protect the railway he found it necessary to ignore the line of demarcation. To prevent Daghestani raids and protect his position he must occupy the whole of Daghestan—that in fact, the line of the 4th June bore no relation to the practical requirements of the situation. On the 4th August therefore, on the advice of the British military mission attached to General Denikin's army, the War Office laid down yet another line of demarcation, this time coinciding with the southern frontier of Daghestan. The whole of the republic being now placed under General Denikin's control, the sphere of his operation was thus brought up to the northern frontier of Azerbaijan.

Caspian Fleet handed over to General Denikin

About the middle of August General Denikin's cause received a still further increase of power. In consequence of the decision of His Majesty's Government to withdraw all British forces from Caucasasia, and because of an evident inability of the Republic of Azerbaijan to man a fleet capable of resisting Bolshevik aggression on the Caspian, the British Caspian fleet was handed over to General Denikin.

These developments, coloured by the impending British evacuation of Transcaucasia—

which would throw the various republics again on their own resources—caused violent dissatisfaction in Azerbaijan, Georgia and Daghestan, and serious effects on the peace of mind of the people in one word and good faith of His Majesty's Government. The republics, it was said, were to be sacrificed to the Russian reactionaries, their nearest interests counted for little, their future for nothing, when watched by Great Britain against her own immediate enemies. She was regarded indeed, with having broken faith with the republics.

Further Risings in Daghestan

Holding in uncompromising hostility General Denikin's avowed purpose of re-establishing Russian control in the Transcaucasian provinces, and anxious to seize any opportunity that might be turned to their own advantage, Georgia and Armenia, when General Denikin attempted to conscript the tribesmen into his army, the white movement rising which resulted was secretly assisted by the two republics—by Georgia in particular—with officers, men and money. This rising General Denikin suppressed, though not before the tribesmen had gained several important successes over his troops.

October 1919 General Denikin's Movement at the Zenith of its Power

General Denikin was now at the zenith of his power. The Volunteer army under his command had grown from modest beginnings to nearly 300,000 men, and had almost completely reconquered the Cossack country of the Kuban and the Don, and had almost completely reconquered the North Caucasian Republic, or Daghestan. He commanded both the Black Sea and the Caspian. In the Black Sea Province between Novorossiysk and Sochi a force calling itself "The Green Guards," anti-reactionary, but also anti-Bolshevik, was co-operating with him. General Yudenitch was marching on Petrograd, and in Siberia, Admiral Koltchak, though in difficulties, was more or less holding his own. The Western Powers, now convinced that General Denikin's movement would end in the overthrow of Bolshevism, were granting almost limitless supplies—by the end of December Great Britain alone had contributed military stores to the value of 20,000,000. It was in these circumstances that General Denikin again turned his attention to the Don front, and, at the head of large forces, advanced into the heart of Russia, driving the Bolsheviks before him. By the middle of October he had reached a matter of days before the ancient capital of Russia should fall into his hands.

But good fortune proved to be the undoing of General Denikin's operations against Bolshevik Russia. The whole movement was based upon misrepresentation, subterfuge, and pretence regarded as justifiable or even creditable means to the end in view.

Causes of General Denikin's Failure

General Denikin himself had doubtless held liberal enough views in the early stages of the revolution when the movement contained no stronger supporters than those at the Imperial court and among officers of the army and navy. The motives of these highly-placed revolutionaries were patriotic and not at all in the direction of social change. Nothing was further from their thoughts than a revolution in which the leading part should be taken by workmen and peasants, and which should for its aim the overthrow of the existing social order. But the revolution which was begun with the desire of purging and reforming the existing Government speedily degenerated into a movement for the complete overthrow of the existing order, and passed with accelerating rapidity under the control of leaders whose aims were not reformation but complete and uncompromising subversion. General Denikin's counter movement had no prospect of success unless it could command peasant support to at least a considerable extent. In the provinces of South Eastern Russia occupied by the Volunteer army various alluring promises were therefore held out to the peasants. The new movement was said to be not at all reactionary. The peasant was to keep everything he had gained by the Bolshevik revolution, if the Volunteer army were successful he was to benefit again under the new Government which would be set up. Certain of these promises doubtless General Denikin honestly intended to fulfil if possible. The great bulk of his supporters and officers, however—thorough-paced reactionaries as by the nature of things they were—had no such intention. They spoke openly of using the peasants for the time being of placing them in their proper position when success should have crowned their efforts. Any system of government for Russia which should confirm the peasants in possession of their newly acquired lands, and confer upon them all the rights which were unthinkable to the dispossessed reactionaries, was unthinkable to the dispossessed reactionaries. General Denikin's movement derived its real energy. General Denikin's successes during the summer of 1919 turned the heads of these people, and the old Russian spirit within them emerged. Justice and far-sighted tolerance in the treatment of the peasantry gave place to exaction and rigid repression in Daghestan, and a similar spirit was shown towards the armed forces on which the reactionary movement itself depended. There was, in fact, no recognition of changed conditions by General

Denikin's staff, no understanding that upon the goodwill and contentment of the population whose country was occupied by the Volunteer army depended, in the long run, a continuance of success.

General Denikin's Aggressions on Georgia

Nor did General Denikin himself avoid high handed and exceedingly impolitic action at this stage. He had always regarded with ill-concealed impatience the aspirations of the Transcaucasian States to independence of Russia—towards Georgia, in particular, he had made no secret of his animosity. He now had the power to give effect to his hostility, and took aggressive action wherever possible notwithstanding the intimate relations between Georgia and Great Britain on the one hand and himself and Great Britain on the other. He disputed the right of Georgia to sail her ships on the Black Sea under the Georgian flag. He seized and interned two of these vessels. He blockaded Georgian ports. He demanded a rectification of the Georgian frontier on the north west and attacked Georgian frontier guards on the river Brak. At this stage, indeed, only British influence prevented Georgian military action on a scale which would have caused General Denikin the most serious embarrassment.

October 1919 Defeat of Russian Reactionary Movements

But the tide was about to turn against all the widely dispersed forces opposing Bolshevism. Towards the close of October General Yudenitch was completely defeated outside Petrograd, and at the same time external difficulties, internal dissensions, and the overbearing noticeable reactionary spirit of his officers reduced Admiral Koltchak's army to political and military impotence. A heavy Bolshevik offensive, launched against General Denikin's army, stopped his advance on Moscow. The population of the country in his rear had been exasperated and alienated by the exactions and misadministration of his subordinates, and his lines of communication were difficult to maintain.

Mutiny in the Caspian Fleet, Collapse of General Denikin's Movement

The whole Province of Daghestan rose in revolt. The Caspian fleet which had been handed over by the British became permeated with discontent, and the crews of several vessels mutinied. General Denikin's troops, too, were now largely composed of unwilling conscripts, the spirit of the old Volunteer army, an army formed chiefly of officers serving in the ranks, no longer existed. The mutiny which set in could not be arrested, and the army which had been counting the days before it should enter Moscow was compelled to retire. No stand was found possible until the familiar line of the Don was reached. Here however the Cossack elements, once the support of the Volunteer army, refused to continue the struggle, and some threatened to attack Denikin's flank. By the end of December 1919 General Denikin's great adventure from which so much had been expected, so much was possible, had collapsed beyond recovery, and danger to Georgia, Azerbaijan and Daghestan from this source thus disappeared.

In carrying the foregoing sketch of General Denikin and the operations of the Volunteer army up to the point where the Russian reactionary movement ceased to exert much influence in Caucasasia, the narrative has got a little ahead of the Transcaucasian. We must now therefore go back to August 1919 in order to complete the present chapter.

Suggestion by His Majesty's Government that the United States should bear part of the Cost of Transcaucasian Occupation.

Early in that month His Majesty's Government informed the American Ambassador that further British expenditure in the military occupation of Caucasasia was impossible, unless the United States were prepared to bear a portion of the cost. The American Government, however, refused, and there now seemed no prospect that America would accept a mandate for any part of the Near East.

August 28, 1919, British Troops evacuate Transcaucasian

On the 28th August 1919, the British troops were therefore withdrawn from Transcaucasian. But a small garrison was left to hold Batoum in order to prevent an immediate dispute between the British and the French over the possession of the port. A battalion each of French and Italian troops were to assist in the occupation, but they never arrived.

CHAPTER V — *The Independent Republics during the Continuance of the British Mission in the Period of the Russian Reactionary Movement.*

From the British evacuation, August 28, 1919, to the Bolshevik occupation of Baku, April 1920.

With the evacuation of British troops from Transcaucasia, the risk of dangerous complications ceased; an awkward entanglement was definitely ended, and His Majesty's Government were able to follow a more detached policy in dealing with Caucasian affairs. During the occupation, British aims had been of a temporary and palliative nature. British troops were sent into the country to ensure the complete evacuation of Transcaucasia by Turkish and German troops. That was the primary aim. Secondary aims were to maintain peace between the Transcaucasian peoples, to assist them in establishing the elements of good government and administration and to make a beginning with reconstruction. At the time of the evacuation these temporary aims may be said to have been attained.

August 1919. *The British Mission under Mr. Wardrop arrives at Tiflis.*

His Majesty's Government recognised, however, that in spite of outward signs of comparative peace there were forces at work which might at any time cause the downfall of the Transcaucasian republics. General Denikin's anti-Bolshevik movement seemed likely to succeed—a movement which Georgia, Azerbaijan and Daghestan appeared determined to resist as containing a decided danger to their independence. With the removal of the British garrison danger from this quarter had obviously increased. It was certain, too, that a great increase of Bolshevik and Turkish propaganda would follow the British withdrawal. His Majesty's Government therefore, despatched to Transcaucasia a diplomatic mission under Mr. O. Wardrop which arrived in Tiflis in August 1919.

Instructions to Mr. Wardrop.

The instructions given by the Foreign Office to Mr. Wardrop may be summarised briefly under three heads. He was to safeguard British interests. He was to give such moral support and advice to the Republics of Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia as he might be able to do without involving His Majesty's Government in any form of continuous obligations. He was to use all his influence to prevent hostilities between General Denikin and the republics, or between the republics themselves.

Situation in Georgia on arrival of the Mission.

On the arrival of Mr. Wardrop's mission the situation in Georgia was extremely involved and difficult both internally and externally. The British troops were being withdrawn and no Great Power was willing to accept the position of mandatory nor to garrison the country temporarily. All attempts at federating the republics had failed: the only aim they had in common was to resist Bolshevism. Georgians were obsessed with the idea of maintaining their complete independence both of Russia and of their neighbours, they were inflated with their own traditions and history, and because their territory had escaped the ravages of war they held vastly exaggerated opinions of the powers of their country and Government.

Situation in Azerbaijan.

The Tatars of Azerbaijan desired independence but recognised that without the British army of occupation they could not maintain the independence they enjoyed. Though not altogether anxious to fall under Turkish rule, the people were saturated with pan-Turanian and pan-Islamic sympathies, and hesitated between a Turkish and a Persian protectorate. The existing Government had been moulded by General Thompson out of the Moussavat Party, which was pan-Islamic and anti-Socialist; the rival Ittihad Party was also pan-Islamic, but held advanced Socialist theories, and was closely united to the infamous Turkish Committee of Union and Progress. The Moussavat Party as a whole favoured union or intimate agreement with Persia, which at the time was regarded at least in this part of the world, as a British protectorate. In fact, proposals to bring this union between Azerbaijan and Persia into effect were actually made by the Persian Minister at Baku, and by certain members of the Moussavat Government of Azerbaijan. At the same time, however, other members of the Government were in

secret agreement with the Committee of Union and Progress, represented by Nuri Pasha and Halil Pasha. But neither party in Azerbaijan had any desire for a federation of Transcaucasian States which should place the Christian elements in predominance.

Situation in Armenia.

In Armenia the Government was in the hands of the advanced Dashnaks. Their policy at first appeared to be to maintain the status quo in the disputed areas of Nachichevan, Zangezur and Karabagh. The Armenian army was chiefly officered by Russian reactionaries, who, together with Colonel Chardigny's French mission, did their utmost to maintain and increase ill-feeling between Armenia and her neighbours. Hostilities in the disputed districts broke out again with the evacuation of the British troops and the arrival of Mr. Wardrop's mission in Transcaucasia. These disputed territories, as has been stated, had been placed under a Mahomedan governor by the arbitration of General Thompson. The French mission had opposed the settlement and urged the Armenians to resist it, the Americans, under Colonel Haskell, the Allied High Commissioner to Armenia, had also supported Armenian claims to the provinces in dispute. But soon after Mr. Wardrop took up his duties at Tiflis Colonel Haskell carried out a settlement which placed Zangezur and Karabagh to Azerbaijan and formed Nachichevan into a neutral zone under an American commissioner. The settlement pleased no one, for it brought many Armenian villages within Azerbaijan territory and also prevented the seasonal migration of nomad Tatar tribes.

The British Mission and General Denikin.

Adding to the difficulties of the situation with which the British mission at Tiflis had to contend at this time was General Denikin's movement, now greatly exciting the Caucasian republics. Increasing appeals were received from the republics for the recognition of their independence. The republics were informed that their requests were receiving consideration, yet simultaneously General Denikin was to be heard pleading that the Caucasian States were in danger from against the Caucasian States wherever possible and actually blockading Georgian ports.

Conflict between General Denikin's forces and Georgia seemed to be the most pressing danger. Only the tact exercised by Mr. Wardrop prevented a serious collision, for the Georgian Government were conscious of being in a position to affect the whole course of General Denikin's fortune.

November 1919. *Meeting between Mr. Wardrop and General Denikin. Staff Collapse of Russian Reactionary Movement.*

In November 1919 Mr. Wardrop arranged a meeting between himself, members of General Denikin's staff and the British military mission attached to the Volunteer army's headquarters. The outcome was that General Denikin agreed to raise the blockade of Georgian ports and return the Georgian ships he had interned. The settlement was a precarious one, and could scarcely have been maintained long. The collapse of General Denikin's movement, however, during December 1919 removed the chief danger to the Caucasian States. General Wrangel's campaign from the Crimea, the failure of that adventure finally eliminated reactionary Russia from Transcaucasian politics. But Turkish influences were now to become more active.

Turkish Influences become More Active in Transcaucasia.

Since the armistice of Mudros, as already stated, Turkish and German officers, including Nuri Pasha, had taken refuge in Daghestan, and that province had become a centre of Turko-German activity. In their opposition to General Denikin's movement both Georgia and Azerbaijan were by these doubtful channels brought into close contact with Turkish influences. In November 1919 a secret agreement was signed between the Nationalist Turks and it was alleged, the Government of Azerbaijan. The Azerbaijan Government, however, denied the existence of the compact and it subsequently transpired that the agreement was concluded by Nuri Pasha and Halil Pasha with certain pro-Turk members of the Moussavat Government of Azerbaijan and not with the Government as a whole. In effect the agreement was a preliminary endeavour to bring Daghestan under the control of

Azerbaijan in case the Daghestanis should succeed in freeing their country of Denikin's forces. With the collapse of General Denikin's movement in December 1919 a definite policy in this direction seems to have been adopted, under Turkish

The fact was that at this time the Transcaucasian policy of the Allies, and especially of His Majesty's Government, had become entirely inexplicable to the Mohammedan mind. On the one hand was the British mission at Tiflis, urging the federation of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan, but excluding Daghestan although in the estimation of the natives that province formed an irreparable part of Transcaucasia. As understood by Mohammedans, the British reasons for this exclusion were somewhat as follows:

Caucasian Mohammedans' Idea of British Reasons for Exclusion

The exclusion of Daghestan from Transcaucasia was needed in order to provide the Cossack portion of an anti Bolshevik Russia with a sea coast on the Caspian. If Russia remained Bolshevik, British policy was believed to envisage the creation of a Cossack State in which Daghestan would be included, again to give a Caspian

coast to the Cossack State. In this arrangement the Cossack State would ensure the domination of Transcaucasia and the Cossack State by the Christian elements of the population. By the same arrangement the Mohammedan elements would be placed in a permanent minority in either State.

Creation of a Moslem State advocated by Colonel Stokes

On the other hand it was well known that Colonel Stokes, the British political officer at Baku, strongly advocated the creation of a single Mohammedan State, extending from the northern frontier of Daghestan to the Persian Gulf, and eastward from the Black Sea to beyond the Caspian, so as to include the Turkoman Mohammedans of Russian Central Asia. Such a State would be peopled chiefly by Moslems of the Shiah rite, and its advocates somewhat fondly supposed, would be in enmity with any Turkish Sunni Moslem State in Asia Minor. It was expected that the Shiah State would lean upon Great Britain and provide a buffer between Russia and the British Asiatic possessions. It was known, further, that Kba Yurmitsky, a Mohammedan colonel in the Russian army, and representative of the Turkomans, had made proposals for the creation of this State in several interviews with Colonel Stokes. Put shortly, Transcaucasian Moslems knew that Mr. Wardrop's mission had sought to create a Christian buffer State, containing a Moslem minority, and that Colonel Stokes stood strongly for a Mohammedan buffer State on a much more grandiose scale, a State intended to divide Islam in Western Asia into two rival, and perhaps hostile, Mohammedan nations. Turkish propaganda in Transcaucasia lost no time in fastening on these conflicting policies. Among other wild statements it was asserted that delay by the Peace Conference in formulating terms of peace for Turkey was due to Great Britain, who would commit herself to nothing until the Russian situation should have cleared.

Effect of these Two Policies on Mohammedans of Western Asia

Meanwhile the Moslems of Western Asia, in Transcaucasia and Transcaucasia. On the one side, Moslems of Azerbaijan, Daghestan and Turkestan, working under Turkish influence, strove for union with the Turkish Nationalists in Asia Minor, who had grown to be a power at the close of 1919. The definite policy was followed, also, of seeking to establish a common frontier between Nationalist Turkey and Azerbaijan. To this end Turkish officers were despatched to lead the Turkoman tribes of Azerbaijan, and to lead the Turkoman tribes of Turkestan, if occupied, would give the common frontier desired. On the other side, the Transcaucasian republics unceasingly pressed the Allied Powers, particularly Great Britain, for political recognition, and for assistance in arms and munitions and other military stores, applications which received sympathetic consideration.

Mohammedans of Daghestan and Azerbaijan openly adopt a Turkish Orientation

The failure of General Denikin's movement at the end of 1919 cleared the situation however and led to changes of Allied policy. It became evident thereafter that Great Britain no longer intended to support the reactionary forces opposed to the Bolsheviks. In January 1920 the Supreme Council at Paris, used the blockade

of Russia. With such developments apparent, the Mohammedans of Azerbaijan and Daghestan openly adopted a definitely Turkish orientation. Against a reactionary Russia these Moslem peoples knew they would have had no chance. Bolshevik Russia was in close alliance with Nationalist Turkey; by going over to this militant Islamic State, with which they were in racial and religious sympathy the Moslems of Caucasus believed they might be able to maintain themselves against a Bolshevik Russia.

Bolshevik Russia turns her Attention to Caucasus

But already fresh complications were in preparation, prompted by the inherent Russian interest in Caucasus. Bolshevik Russia took the same interest in Caucasus that the reactionary movement of General Denikin had shown, the same interest that old Tsarist Russia had taken. It seemed impossible for Caucasus to tear herself free from the geographical and economic bonds which bound her fortunes with those of Russia.

Chicherin's Declaration regarding Transcaucasia

As far back as October 1919 the Bolshevik Government of Russia had turned their attention to the wider political possibilities presented in Transcaucasia and Turkey by the rise of Nationalist Turkey. From this time onward the existence of a very definite Russian policy regarding these regions became evident. In the same month Chicherin published his declaration that Soviet Russia entertained no aggressive designs against the independence of the Caucasian States. By Russian Bolshevik efforts an agreement was arranged between Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia regarding transport facilities and the territorial disputes between the three republics, and though the settlement was not of long duration, it served to show that Bolshevik policy was the systematic conquest of Turkestan and Bokhara, which placed all Transcaucasia again in Russian hands by February 1920.

November 1919 Bolshevik Approach to Turkish Nationalists

But the most important development of Russian policy at this stage was the approach to Turkish Nationalism. Bolshevik Russia and Nationalist Turkey had various aims in common. They had the same enemies. They were both in political, military and economic isolation. Each was capable of giving invaluable assistance to the other. In November 1919 negotiations took place between the Soviet Government and the agents of Mustafa Kemal Pasha's Government. From this time onwards a series of treaties and agreements appear to have been concluded between Soviet Russia and Nationalist Turkey. Apparent harmony in the aims pursued in the measures taken soon showed itself. Working together Turkish and Bolshevik forces fostered and directed revolts against Russian reactionaries in Daghestan. After the failure of Denikin and Wrangel both Nuri Pasha and Nohi Pasha disappeared from Daghestan, and left the tribesmen to the unquestioned control of the Bolsheviks.

January 1920 De facto Recognition of Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan

As some sort of offset to the common policy now being pursued by Bolshevik Russia and Nationalist Turkey, the Allied Powers, in January 1920, granted *de facto* recognition to the Governments of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. At about the same time His Majesty's Government withdrew British support from the Russian reactionary movement. In February 1920 the Allied Powers announced that Constantinople, together with a small piece of territory in Europe, would remain in Turkish hands.

Russian Suspicious of the Allies in Caucasus. Withdrawal of Mr. Wardrop from the British Mission and Appointment of Commander Luke, R.N.R.

The two events mentioned in the previous paragraph which fell closely together, had a great and immediate effect upon Russian policy in Caucasus. The Soviet Government deduced from them that the Allies had only recognised the independence of the Transcaucasian States after Russian reactionary movements had definitely failed, and when no possibility remained of

placing Caucasia under friendly reactionary Russian tutelage as a buffer state between Bolshevism and the East. The Soviet Government deduced, further, that the concessions to Turkey and to Mahomedan feeling by the Allies portended an eventual arrangement between Turkey and Great Britain regarding Caucasia and Central Asia perhaps even an arrangement in which a British-protected Persia would be included. They were confirmed in these suspicions by the withdrawal of Mr. Wardrop, whose earlier career in Russia had shown him to be a friend of the Russian people, and his replacement by Commander Luke, R.N.R. who had spent much time in the East and whose particular knowledge was Eastern and not Russian. In the view of the Soviet Government Great Britain was now seeking to create a Mahomedan buffer State in the Middle East which should be hostile to Bolshevism.

March 1920. Bolshevik Russia's Measures in Caucasia

The moment did not appear propitious for aggressive Bolshevik measures to combat the imagined danger. Russia could not spare large numbers of troops for an offensive in Transcaucasia, and the Anglo-Russian Trade Agreement was being negotiated. Certain precautionary steps, however, were taken. The Bolshevik mission to Afghanistan was strengthened in importance and numbers. A new and more explicit agreement with Mustapha Kemal Pasha was signed in March 1920 and the Nationalist Government was supplied with money and arms from Moscow. The subjugation of hostile tribes in Central Asia was continued with increased rapidity. And, also, in March, at the invitation of the Moscow Government, both Azerbaijan and Georgia entered into peace negotiations with Soviet Russia. The result of the agreement which was signed at Moscow on April 22, 1920, was the recognition of the frontier of Azerbaijan.

April 27-28, 1920. Bolshevik Revolution at Baku, and Occupation by 11th Soviet Army

Everything being now in readiness, a prepared revolution took place at Baku on April 27-28, 1920, under the direction of the 11th Soviet Army. Turkish officers joined by a few members of the Nationalist Government resigned, and were replaced by a Turkic Ittihad Government, which proclaimed a Soviet Republic and Administration. According to previous arrangement, an appeal was then made to Soviet Russia for armed assistance, and instructors versed in the theory and practice of Communism. The Bolshevik army on the northern frontier was then transported to Baku. The Turkish agents, who had played their part, and were now much in the way, were shot or expelled. A declaration was issued stating that the new Government in Baku was in complete harmony with that of Moscow. Industry and shipping were nationalised, the Azerbaijan army was partially disbanded and the remainder incorporated in the 11th Soviet army, and an Extraordinary Commission against espionage and revolts was established. By means of what was called an internal and peaceful revolution, Baku was thus endowed with Soviet Government and again brought under Russian control.

Russia's Purposes in Reoccupying Baku

The recovery of Baku at a time when Russia was, apparently, fully occupied with her war against Germany, was a surprise to many. The accomplishment of which, in the Soviet view, admitted of no delay. They were the destruction of the Mahomedan bloc, in process of formation under Turkish guidance and impulsion in Azerbaijan, Daghestan and Transcaucasia, which it was hoped would be used during the winter of 1920, and in the campaign against Poland. But in its wider political aspects the Russian recapture of Baku was the first deliberate step by the Bolshevik Government to regain Transcaucasia and to re-establish Russia in her old advantageous and dominating position in South Western Asia.

The Independent Republics during the Continuance of the British Mission. Period of Bolshevik and Turkish Aggression.

From the Turkish occupation of Baku on April 28, 1920, to the overthrow of the independent republics, the creation of Soviet republics and the withdrawal of the British mission.

After their recapture of Baku the Bolsheviks lost no time in pushing their resources and energy of the State. They at first encouraged the Tatars of Azerbaijan to continue the struggle against the Armenians in the disputed area of Zangezur though with no intention that the Tatars themselves should gain possession of the territory and thus establish permanent communication with Nationalist Turkey.

May 7, 1920. Treaty between Azerbaijan and Georgia. June 7, 1920. Treaty between Georgia and Russia. - Armenia refuses to sign Treaty with Russia - Bolshevik Risings follow in Armenia

But it was soon found that Bolshevik interests would be better served at this stage by peace making than by war. On the 7th May, therefore, a treaty was signed between Azerbaijan and Georgia providing for the settlement of disputes by arbitration for the resumption of trading, and the transportation of goods. This treaty was followed on the 8th June, by a treaty between Georgia and Bolshevik Russia in which assurances of good faith were exchanged. Treaties between Bolshevik Russia and Armenia and Azerbaijan were also drafted but the Armenians refused to sign owing to conditions which required the transportation of Soviet troops upon the Karabagh to Russian control as a temporary measure. Bolshevik propaganda had been intensified in Armenia since the fall of Baku with the result that Bolshevik risings had taken place at Alexandropol, Kara, Novo Noyazid and Karpizman during May and June. The Armenian Government however had recovered these places and the British Government saw no reason why they should yield to pressure applied from Moscow.

Rising against Bolsheviks in Azerbaijan

At the end of June a rising on a considerable scale occurred in the district of Elizavetopol. The result of these savage reprisals was to alienate Moslems from Bolshevism yet further.

The Supreme Council propose to create a Free State of Batoum - July 7, 1920. British Garrison withdrawn from Batoum - Agreement regarding Access to Batoum by Georgia and Azerbaijan

In drafting the Treaty of Peace with Turkey the Supreme Council, recognising the importance of Batoum, had proposed to make the port and the railway through it, a Free State. This proposal, however, was not carried out, as likely to be unworkable in practice. It was bitterly opposed by Georgians, by Russians—whether reactionary or Bolshevik—and, so far as they mattered, by the Nationalist Turks. Nor was it at all clear that the League of Nations would be competent to discharge the duties of a Free State. On July 7, 1920, therefore, the British garrison was withdrawn and the town and province were handed over to Georgia under an agreement between the British and the Georgian Government. Armenia and Georgia further undertook to grant Armenia a concession for a railway through the valley of the Chirchik between Batoum and Armenia. It was hoped the independent republics would be secured perpetually and the British mission would be able to withdraw.

July 1920. Bolshevik Ultimatum to the Armenian Government

By the end of July 1920 the Polish campaign had turned definitely in favour of the Bolsheviks. Relieved of this anxiety Moscow presented an ultimatum to Armenia demanding the immediate acceptance of the draft treaty of June, to this Armenia returned no reply. Orders were given, in consequence, for the 11th Soviet army to occupy the disputed areas of Zangezur and Karabagh.

August 1920. Armenian Government accept Bolshevik Terms. De jure Recognition of Armenia by the Allies.

On the 10th August, the Soviet representative at Erivan threatened a still further advance of the army, and compelled the Armenian Government to sign the treaty. Commander Luke, the acting British Commissioner, protested to the Armenian Government against their acceptance of the Soviet terms. On the 5th August, a large consignment of arms and munitions for Armenia reached Batoum, and were forwarded through Georgia to their destination. Curiously enough, on the 20th August, the Armenian delegates in Europe were invited to sign the Treaty of Trianon, in this way their Government secured *de jure* recognition by the Allies.

A period of comparative peace followed, broken only by periodical armed conflicts between Armenian partisan forces and the Red troops in occupation of Zangezur and Karabagh. In these affairs, the Government at Moscow appear to have taken little interest. Having secured territory giving direct access to Nationalist Turkey, they were satisfied to wait, and leave the completion of their designs until they were less occupied elsewhere.

Even in this unfortunate condition of the Armenian Republic dissension was not abated. The Dashnak Government was in ill favour and efforts were made to form a coalition Government of all parties, the Dashnaks, however, refused to take part, and their opponents were unable to persuade or compel them either to agree to combination, or to modify their policy and enter into a defensive alliance with Georgia. Meanwhile, Bolshevik and Turkish propagandists were busy among the population, with results which became apparent a few months later.

The Oriental Congress at Baku

During the period immediately following the capture of Baku, Russia made full use of her position. In a wide sense Baku occupies the position of metropolis in the Caspian basin. Caucasus, North Persia, the Volga region and Mahomedan Central Asia all look to Baku, not only as the chief commercial centre, but as the one centre of news, education and general culture within reach. This position in her hands, Russia has used to her advantage. Here, further, during the latter part of 1920, she convened a series of conferences—particularly the Oriental Congress under the presidency of Zinoviev attended by thousands of delegates from all parts of the East—with the view of spreading Bolshevik doctrines and influence. This congress, whatever its wider advantages to Bolshevism, was the scene of much plain speaking against Bolshevism by various delegates. Tatar delegates complained of the massacre of Tatars by the Bolsheviks in the Crimea, and delegates from the Caucasus and Persia of the oppression of Moslem populations in Central Asian States by Bolshevik troops. Even in this exchange Zinoviev stated plainly, if unwisely, that the Turks should cherish no illusions regarding the Russo-Turkish agreement lately concluded, for it was a mere truce, and that the Russian Government was determined to restore Nationalist Turkey.

September 1920. Withdrawal of Commander Luke and Appointment of Colonel Stokes in his place

A British diplomatic change which produced considerable results in Transcaucasia deserves some attention at this stage. Commander Luke was withdrawn, during September 1920, from the position of acting British High Commissioner, and Colonel Stokes, to whose views reference has already been made was appointed in his place. Commander Luke had continued the policy followed by Mr. Wardrop in giving support to anti-Bolshevik and anti-Turk elements in Transcaucasia. He had thus greatly disappointed the Mahomedan inhabitants in general. On several occasions he had been approached by the pro-Turkish party in Daghestan with the

proposal that Great Britain should encourage and finance a rising in Daghestan to expel the Bolsheviks from that province and from Azerbaijan. Circumstances indeed were propitious for such action, but for obvious reasons His Majesty's Government could not entertain the policy suggested.

Effect on Transcaucasian Opinion of Colonel Stokes's Appointment

The appointment of Colonel Stokes, therefore, who was known to be a Russo-phobe and to hold the view that it was a necessity for the British Empire to obtain and retain Mahomedan friendship in every quarter, was taken to indicate the adoption of a policy other than that which had guided Mr. Wardrop and Commander Luke. Various matters combined to give colour to this idea. The province and the people of Transcaucasia had been long under the influence of the British. It was not only imminent, but that the collapse would be final. Press utterances in Great Britain and India, coupled with the recent decision of the Allies that Constantinople should remain under Turkish sovereignty, were regarded as proving the existence of a great body of British and Indian opinion anxious to make the utmost concessions to secure Mahomedan goodwill. Caucasian Mahomedans, therefore, putting two and two together, were convinced that Colonel Stokes's appointment marked a change of British policy in their favour.

Bolshevik Propaganda and the Appointment of Colonel Stokes

Playing upon these beliefs, an insidious propaganda was conducted by Bolshevik agents in Georgia and Armenia. They advised the Armenian Government to create a buffer State between Russia and her Eastern possessions which she regarded as a necessity. Armenians, in particular, were advised that Russian Bolshevik domination would be greatly preferable to domination by a Turko-Georgian alliance. With this view the great majority of Armenians were likely to be in hearty agreement. It is improbable that the propagandism in question affected the course of the developments which took place after the campaign.

Russo-Turkish Military Operations against Armenia and Georgia

We come now to the Russo-Turkish military operations against the republics of Georgia and Armenia whereby the aggressor Powers achieved the aims upon which they had agreed. By these operations Nationalist Turkey obtained the greater part of the territory awarded to Turkey by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, but evacuated under the armistice of Mudros, and Russia re-established herself in the remaining portions of Transcaucasia.

The Treaty of Secres as the Origin of Turkish Nationalism.—Ambitions of the Pontic Greeks.—Negotiations between the Armenians and the Pontic Greeks

To follow this aggression more closely it is necessary to go back to July 1920 and to glance also at the draft Treaty of Secres then in its final form. Article 88 of the treaty referred to the decision of President Wilson the questions of how much Ottoman territory should be incorporated in the Armenian State and the line of frontier to be adopted. Resistance of the surrender of any Ottoman territory to the Armenian State was one of the chief aims of the Turkish Nationalist movement. To give effect to this purpose a comparatively strong Turkish force, under the command of Kiazim Kara Bekir Pasha, was assembled and maintained in and around Erzeroum. This army was also charged with the duty of watching the Pontic Greeks, who had ambitions of establishing a republic in the vaguely defined region of Pontus, bordering on the Black Sea. The Government of the Armenian Republic had in view measures of their own for obtaining possession of territory in Turkish Armenia, one of these measures was to secure the co-operation of the Pontic Greeks, in fact informal negotiations between the Armenians and the Pontic Greeks seem to have taken place during July 1920, in which each party endeavoured to use the other for its own ends. Certain Greeks, possibly without the knowledge of the Hellenic Government, made the Armenian Government an offer of arms and munitions conditionally that Armenian forces should attack Kiazim Kara Bekir's army when the Pontic Greeks rose in revolt. It is reported, indeed, that at this time a million rounds of small arm ammunition was delivered at Batoum from Greek sources for Armenian use.

July 1920 *Ultimatum from Nationalist Turkey to the Armenian Government*

The Turkish Nationalist Government, doubtless, were not unaware of these negotiations. At the end of July 1920 the Government of Angora required the Armenians to withdraw their troops from the Province of Olti, and retire behind the frontier laid down by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. The Armenian Government refused to comply with this demand. They maintained that the treaty having been concluded with the Central Turkish Government at Constantinople, which the Angora Government did not recognise it did not apply between Nationalist Turkey and Armenia. And also, that Armenia having just signed the Treaty of Sèvres, under which the western frontiers of Armenia were to be defined by President Wilson, no discussion on the subject of the frontier was possible. The Armenian Government stated further

Russo-Turkish frontier, and that they expected the Nationalist Government to observe the same correct attitude.

United Action in Transcaucasia by Russia and Turkey

No active use had been made of the Nationalist Bolshevik understanding or agreement of November 1919—by either contracting party. The agreement seems to have been a mere arrangement by which each side was to call on the services of the other in case of necessity. Under it, however, the Nationalist Government had already obtained arms and munitions, and a measure of financial assistance, and had certainly gained increased prestige among their own people. But now the Turks were proposed to avail themselves of the greater advantages their pact conferred, and settle Transcaucasian problems to their own benefit.

Internal Conditions in Transcaucasia at this Stage

The internal condition of the Transcaucasian republics was promising from the Russian point of view. A pro-Russian spirit was displaying itself in Armenian Government circles, stimulated by fear of the Nationalist Turks, on the one hand, and of the Azerbaijan Tatars on the other. Armenia and Georgia had also grown, if possible even more distrustful of each other than before. Continuation between them had become exceedingly unlikely.

Military Embarrassments of Russia

In the field of Russia's external activities, however, the situation was not so favourable, free from embarrassment. She was conducting a campaign in 1920, was negotiating the Anglo-Russian Trade Agreement, and a military attack of Georgia and Armenia might well cause failure in this important matter. She had, therefore, to go warily, and for a time, mask her co-operation in Transcaucasian military operations by acting through the Red Republic of Azerbaijan, and by supporting the Nationalist Turks.

October 1920. Armistice between Russia and Poland

But at the beginning of October 1920 an armistice was signed between Russia and Poland, which led to the Treaty of Riga, ratified in November following. Free on the Polish front Russia was able to crush the remnants of General Wrangel's army in the Crimea. By the end of October both her Polish and Crimean military entanglements had ceased to exist, and she could give undivided attention to prosecuting her designs against the Republics of Georgia and Armenia. At the end of the month she was in a position to announce a new line of Turkish policy, a course not altogether in accordance with Bolshevik desires, and to call for immediate Russian action.

Action by Kiazim Kara Bekir Pasha.—September 1920. Surprise Attack on Armenia by Turkish Troops

We have seen that at the end of July 1920 the Nationalist Government at Angora had required the Armenian Republic to withdraw its troops from the district of Olti, and retire behind the frontier defined in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, and that the Armenian Government had refused to comply. It is not possible as yet to trace the exact course of events which led to this. But it seems probable that in September 1920 Kiazim Kara Bekir Pasha,

commanding Nationalist troops in North Eastern Anatoia, was determined to do so, and adopted measures at variance with the policy in which Moscow and Angora had decided. He was opposed to Turkish co-operation with Bolshevik Russia on the ground that Bolshevism was in flat contradiction to the teachings of Islam. He was in bitter personal enmity with Enver Pasha, the chief Turkish protagonist of Bolshevism, on occasion too, he had not hesitated to oppose even Mustapha Kemal Pasha. In his command at Erzerum he occupied a position of great independence. He was, further, an able man, of strong and determined character, who may well have been tempted to become dictator himself. In view therefore of the Turkish demand in July, and the knowledge that the Panu were preparing a rising, it is not astonishing that at the end of September, Kiazim Kara Bekir Pasha made a surprise attack upon the Armenian forces holding Olti, the most westerly frontier town in the Armenian Republic. The fighting which ensued in this district was at the time inconclusive, for both sides were able to claim successes.

October 1920. Azerbaijan, too, begins Hostilities against Armenia.—Another Turkish offensive against Armenia. October 1920. Bolshevik Mission to Angora.—Turks and Bolsheviks in Conference at Baku and Erzerum

But the advance on Olti appears to have been part of a much larger and more ambitious series of operations. During the first week in October Azerbaijan Red troops began hostilities against Armenia in the districts of Karabagh and Zangezur, an attack which coincided with the arrival of strong Russian reinforcements at Baku. At the same time Kiazim Kara Bekir Pasha opened a third offensive, now in the south western part of Armenia, and directed against Sarikamish and Kargisman. At this point the Moscow Government seem to have had much to say.

Arrived in the Nationalist capital during the first week in October, provided with a great sum of money chiefly in gold. An incident, not without meaning at this juncture, was the appointment of a prominent Georgian, Budu Mdvanli by name, to an important position in the Russian mission. As soon as the mission had reached Angora, Moscow also convened conferences at Baku and Erzerum, attended by Turkish Nationalist leaders and representatives of Soviet Russia and Red Azerbaijan. At the Erzerum conference Kiazim Kara Bekir Pasha was present, and it is believed that here he was persuaded to Turkish co-operation with Russia instead of following an exclusively Turkish policy in Transcaucasia—by a Russian promise to hand over the districts of Kars and Ardahan to Turkish sovereignty.

October 1920. Moscow Ultimatum to Armenia.—Georgian Government declines to make an Offence Alliance with Armenia.—Georgia Offers to Armenia

Meanwhile, military operations against Armenia were continued without pause. On the 12th October the Armenian forces were compelled to evacuate both Sarikamish and Kargisman. On the 13th October the Moscow Soviet directly asserted itself by sending an ultimatum demanding immediate acceptance of the terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk by the Armenian Government. The Armenian Government refused, and put forward counter-claims with the view of gaining time, and in the hope that Georgia would give armed assistance. Of such help being given there was no likelihood at such a late date. The Georgian Government declined to make any kind of defensive alliance with Armenia, but made instead an offer which, if accepted, would be of advantage to their own republic, and at the same time involve it in no liabilities. They would carry out a compulsory mobilisation of all Armenians in Georgian territory—a measure intended to get rid of the Armenian element, and thus strengthen the Armenian army. They would permit the delivery in Georgian ports and the conveyance by Georgian railways of arms and munitions for Armenian use, subject to a tax of 27 per cent in kind upon everything received or conveyed. They would address a request to the Allies for arms to be supplied to both republics, and that Allied troops should occupy Trebizond.

Armenia in Straits, October 20, 1920. Russian Troops Concentrate against Armenia. Western Russia in Armenia. November 7, 1920. Turko-Armenian Armistice

Nothing better than these facile offers of aid being forthcoming from Georgia, the Armenian Government was forced to accept the Russian offer of aid.

determination of the people and Government seem, in consequence, to have weakened Resistance, though hopeless, was, however, continued. On the 20th October the Armenian troops were forced out of Igdir by the Turks, who were now approaching the Armenian capital. On the same day Russian troops from Baku began to concentrate at Delijan on the north-eastern frontier of the republic, though no fighting took place. On the 21st October Kars, the chief Armenian fortress, fell to the troops of Kiazim Kara Bekir Pasha. On the 6th November a rising of the Mahomedan population in the Province of Alexandropol began, which cut the communications in the rear of a large part of the Armenian army. The Armenian position was now so hopeless that the troops became demoralised: on the 7th November, therefore, the general commanding requested and obtained an armistice.

November 1920. Mustapha Kemal Pasha's Terms of Peace - Armenian Government Refuse Nationalist Terms of Peace. Turks recommence Hostilities. - November 13 1920 The Armistice Renewed

Terms of peace were received from Mustapha Kemal Pasha on the 16th November. They included the surrender of large quantities of arms and munitions and the surrender of Armenian territory north of a line drawn from the northern end of Lake Goktrha to the junction of the Arpa Chai with the Araxes. This line of frontier would have given the Turks nearly the whole of the district of Etchmizdzin in addition to the districts of Kars and Ardahan - which they claimed under the Treaty of Brest Litovsk - and left the Armenian Republic little more than the district of Erivan. Even in the present desperate position of their country the Armenian Government found these terms too onerous for acceptance. They accordingly asked for a conference to discuss the conditions proposed, but Kiazim Kara Bekir Pasha replied by recommencing hostilities and driving the Armenians out of Ani and Karaklis. The armistice was renewed on the 18th November under which Armenian troops were withdrawn to the eastern bank of the River Arpa Chai and the Turks occupied the Provinces of Olti, Ardahan and Alexandropol. It became known later that during the autumn and winter 1920-21 the Turks had massacred some 50,000 Armenian inhabitants in the area under their occupation.

Demoralisation in Armenia - Bolshevik Revolution in Armenia, a Soviet Government Established - November 1920 Treaty of Peace between Soviet Armenia and Turkey

For the time being Armenian prospects were of the darkest. Administration, communications and supplies, all were in a state of chaos. Every unit of the army had recently received large drafts of recruits without training or discipline with the result that the utmost demoralisation prevailed. Bolshevik propaganda, too, had been busy with army and people alike demonstrating to all the folly of relying upon any external aid except from Russia or Turkey. In the light of recent experiences, this advice found many Armenians in agreement. Amid these conditions Bolshevik agents did not find revolution a difficult movement to organise and carry through. It was effected in a few days, and the Dashnak Government were removed. As at Baku, a Soviet Government was established, Bolshevik troops were invited to assist in maintaining order and competent Bolshevik instructors were asked for in order to establish Bolshevik rule in all its purity and intricacies. The new Government then signed a peace with the Turkish Nationalists. The chief territorial change under the treaty was that the districts of Kars and Ardahan, and Armenian territory up to the right bank of the Arpa Chai passed to Turkish sovereignty.

A Dashnak State set up in Zangezur - 1921 Dashnak Zangezur Suppressed

A portion of the Armenian army, however, remained loyal to the Dashnak Government and retreated to the mountainous region of Zangezur under its leader Khapen Terminissian. Terminissian and his troops subsequently attacked Erivan and re-established a Dashnak Government for a few weeks. But reinforcements of Red troops were brought up, dislodged the Dashnak force, and replaced the Soviet Government in power. Terminissian and his army then again retired to Zangezur where an independent Dashnak State was maintained until the summer of 1921 when it was finally suppressed by Red forces from Azerbaijan and Russia.

Causes of Armenian Downfall.

As a wide generalisation it may be said that the chief cause of the downfall of Armenia was internal dissension. Not so much, perhaps, during the final attack upon the republic - it was then too late for unity to avail - as at all earlier times since the collapse of Russia. Dashnaks and Democrats had always their own uncongenial promising aims. But another line of cleavage, which, as it were, ran diagonally across all others, was between Transcaucasian and Turkish Armenians. Between these two main divisions of the race there was, indeed, a certain native incompatibility, not only in political outlook, but also in personal intercourse, which under the stress of events grew sometimes to positive dislike and even hostility.

Political Development of Caucasian Armenians

Taken as a whole, the Armenian peasants of Transcaucasia are an exceedingly primitive people, in this respect not far removed from their Tatar neighbours. The Armenian commercial and professional classes, on the other hand, are steeped in Russian tradition, and have gone far towards being Russified. Almost instinctively they are attracted to the Bolsheviks, and are usually able to carry the ignorant mass of their Armenian peasant countrymen with them.

The reason for this feeling of dependence on Russia is not difficult to find. During the period of Prince Galitzin's vice-royalty, 1905-7 Caucasian Armenians had suffered greatly from insecurity, but under the succeeding Viceroys, Count Vorontsof Daskof and the Grand Duke Nicholas, security was assured them and they received particular attention. This treatment had a marked effect on the well-to-do and educated classes of Caucasian Armenians. Already they had shown a tendency to make their political aims subservient to their commercial aims and to the more and more lost interest in Armenian national and Church affairs. Such matters were left to fanatical Nationalists and Socialists - to idealist partisan soldiers, writers, poets and orators - generally men with little knowledge of the world, and little reading outside the bounds of their own particular aims. Armenians of education and familiarity with the outer world, men who might have influenced and led their more ignorant Armenian countrymen, had, in fact, almost universally neglected their national duties and opportunities, with the result that the bulk of the Armenian race in Caucasasia had already gone far on a revolutionary course. They had largely given their support to the Dashnaktsutun Society, to its political aims, to its secret and terrorist methods. And their extremist and idealist leaders had found in this great terrorist society the effective means of financing their projects by compulsory contributions from the rich commercial class, who took no interest in Armenian politics. In a very intimate way, in fact, the Dashnaktsutun Society represented the Armenian population of Caucasasia.

Political Development of Turkish Armenians

But Turkish Armenians, as a whole had been affected by conditions of another character. The perpetual insecurity in which they lived under Turkish rule had bound all classes together in a common Armenian cause, hardly distinguishable from a ceaseless struggle for life. Among Turkish Armenians education had become almost universal. Many of them were bilingual, and some were trilingual, and Turkish Armenians could read and speak English, and habitually read English and American newspapers and books, and sought the company of English and American residents and visitors. Turkish Armenians had therefore, a far more complete and correct knowledge of the outer world, its movements, influences and politics, and the Armenian cause to such matters, than had their Caucasian brethren. Their political ideals were democratic rather than socialist or revolutionary. They had never kept their hopes fixed upon national aims alone in politics and Church. Their leaders, too, were men of the highest capacity and vision, and they were not so easily misled by the promises of a few fanatical leaders. They were, however, far removed from the respectability of the much less civilised countrymen in Caucasasia by the Turkish horrors of 1915-16. They came as destitute refugees, but anxious to do what they could for the cause of Armenia as they saw it. That the two sections of the race, driven into this close involuntary contact amid such unhappy and disastrous circumstances, should develop differences of opinion, policy and ultimate aim need cause no astonishment.

Differing Armenian Territorial Aims

On the important and highly involved question of what regions an independent Armenia should comprise Turkish and Caucasian Armenians were seldom able to agree. Turkish Armenians hoped to secure as much as possible of the so-called Six Armenian Vilayets of Anatolia—Van, Bitlis, Erzeroum, Sivas, Diarbekir and Kharpout—as a minimum, and were fraught with difficulty. They had ambitions, too, in Cilicia. Transcaspian Armenians generally considered these aims impracticable, and it was only after much discussion that Transcaucasian and Turkish Armenians agreed to suppress their rival policies and seek a common Armenian State. Even so it was with misgivings on the part of Caucasian Armenians. With such grave differences ever preventing harmony of aim Armenian power never reached its full development either in attainment or resistance.

Change of View by Turkish Armenians

After the destruction of the Independent Armenian Republic and the failure of the Allied Powers to obtain for the Armenian people the territory in Anatolia awarded by President Wilson, the views of Turkish Armenians seem to have undergone a change. They recognised that no immediate hope existed of an independent or autonomous Armenia being established in North Eastern Asia Minor. But they recognised, too, that a large body of Russian opinion favoured the idea of obtaining President Wilson's frontiers for a future Armenian State, when a suitable opportunity should offer and of thus extending Russian influence, and perhaps Russian territory, to this extent. For the time being, therefore, the efforts of Turkish Armenians appear to be concentrated on securing, if possible some kind of Armenian national home in Cilicia. But even this more modest aim, one supposes, will prove as little likely of attainment as the other so long as the Turkish State retains its present national dislocation and military power.

Overthrow of Georgian Republic by the Bolsheviks and Turks

We come now to the closing events of the Independent Republic of Georgia whose people had been unable to understand that, in the presence of Bolshevik Russia, the only way to secure their independence was to secure the independence of their Armenian neighbours. To these neighbours the Georgians had steadily refused assistance. They had stood out for their own immediate interests as they understood them; they were now to reap the reward.

Georgia already a Socialist State

With two provinces of the Armenian Republic annexed to Turkey, and the remaining portions subjected to Bolshevik Russia, Georgia stood isolated as the only free State in the Caucasus. The Russian Government, however, appeared a more difficult and dangerous problem than of Azerbaijan or Armenia. The Russian Government of Georgia was based on a deep national sentiment, and Bolshevik risings attempted in 1919 and early in 1920 had failed utterly. The Social Democratic Government of Georgia had already nationalised land and industry, and given the people nearly as much as was required by the complete theory of Bolshevism. Russian Communism had, in fact, been forestalled, and largely robbed of any advantages it could promise. At this time Georgia was, indeed, an advanced Socialist State, in which the people retained a strong sense of nationality.

Russian Secret Military Report on Operations needful against Georgia

A despatch from the Russian commander-in-chief in the Caucasus to his Government, intercepted by the Georgian authorities in December 1920, showed clearly the intentions of Russia towards the republic, and what the Georgians might soon expect. The despatch in question, written by General Hecker, was in reply to a request from Moscow asking for his views upon the possibility of immediately overthrowing Georgia. The gist of his report was that the co-operation of Armenian and Nationalist Turkey with Russia was essential to secure success.

December 1920 The Armenian General Dro advocates the Overthrow of Georgia.

The Russian Government appear to have called for Hecker's report as the result of arguments advanced by the Armenian General Dro, at once a Socialist and Dashnakist, who had been summoned to Moscow, after

Armenia became a Soviet republic, to give his views in person. Dro urged his opinion that the existence of an anti-Bolshevik Georgian State, supported by the Entente Powers, was a standing menace to the Armenian Soviet Republic, that revision of the Treaty of Sevres had become certain; that revision, when it came, would inevitably be in a direction seeking to placate Nationalist Turkey, and that the outcome was likely to be an alliance of Georgia and Azerbaijan with Turkey with the goodwill of the Entente Powers, or at least of Great Britain. If this happened, Russia, he argued, would lose her influence with Turkish Nationalists. With these as probabilities Dro therefore urged that the subjugation of Georgia before the Treaty of Sevres could be revised was of vital importance. If that were done, Russia would obtain possession of the whole of the Transcaucasian railway system, and an alliance between Turkey and any of the Caucasian States would become out of the question.

Lenin Disapproves of Dro's Scheme, but the Russian Central Executive Committee Approves

Lenin is believed to have strenuously opposed the scheme, maintaining that peace and reconstruction were more important, and that no infringement of the spirit of the Anglo-Russian Trade Agreement, then nearing completion, should be allowed to take place. Dro's report, however, was approved by Trotsky and the majority of the Russian Central Executive Committee. A plan of operations then seems to have been adopted whereby the proposed aggression should appear to come from Armenia and Azerbaijan.

February 12 1921 Russo-Armenian Rising in Georgian Territory—Armenian and Azerbaijan Armies Mobilised against Georgia

On the 12th February, 1921, therefore, a rising of Molokan Russians and Armenians occurred in the district of Borchalinsk—a district always in dispute between Georgia and Armenia—against Georgian administration, and Georgian garrisons were attacked. Moscow disclaimed all knowledge of this outbreak. Chicherin indeed actually telegraphed instructions to the Armenian Government to prevent any further rising. But, by 12th February the whole of the Armenian army was mobilised against Georgia, and on the Azerbaijan frontier, troops, identified as of the 11th Red Army from Azerbaijan, had crossed into Georgia and reached Sadakht. At the same time, however, the Georgian Government, however, refused to accept mediation on the terms put forward, convinced that now there was nothing for it but to resist.

February 20 Russian Troops in Action

On the 20th February two attacks developed, both of which, from the position of the operations, must have been made by Russian troops. The first was at Duriel Pass on the Russian military road leading across the Caucasus Mountains from Vladikavkaz to Tiflis, the other at Gagra, on the Black Sea coast, a little north of the river Bzyb. A day later the 11th Red Army from Azerbaijan, composed of Tatars and Russians, attacked in force at Podi, the frontier station on the railway from Azerbaijan to Tiflis. The attack was successful, and the Georgian troops were driven down in the intercepted report by General Hecker.

Turkish Ultimatum to the Georgian Government

On the 21st and 22nd February the Georgian Government, their country surrounded and attacked on every front, reported to the Russian Government that they were in a position to accept the Russian ultimatum. The Russian Government, however, refused to accept the Georgian ultimatum, and the Georgian Government, in reply, stated that for some time secret negotiations had been taking place between the Georgian Government and Armenia with the purpose of securing the independence of Georgia. The Russian Government, however, refused to accept the Georgian ultimatum, and the Georgian Government, in reply, stated that for some time secret negotiations had been taking place between the Georgian Government and Armenia with the purpose of securing the independence of Georgia. The Russian Government, however, refused to accept the Georgian ultimatum, and the Georgian Government, in reply, stated that for some time secret negotiations had been taking place between the Georgian Government and Armenia with the purpose of securing the independence of Georgia.

demanded that they should make it a condition of their agreement that Turkish forces should temporarily occupy Batoum as well. The apparent purpose of this was to secure the town for the Turkish army. On the other hand, the scheme seemed to offer prospects of securing the place for themselves again.

February 25 Georgian Army evacuates Tiflis March 11. Turkish Troops enter Batoum

On the 25th February the Georgian army was compelled to evacuate Tiflis. During the succeeding ten days severe fighting took place at various points, in which the invaders did not always have everything their own way. But they greatly outnumbered the Georgians, who were gradually forced westward towards the Black Sea coast. Eventually, one portion of the Georgian army retired to Kutais, where the Government were established temporarily, and the other portion retreated towards Batoum. On the 11th March, Turkish troops entered Batoum, having already occupied Ardahan and Artvin.

Position at Batoum

The position at Batoum at this time was curious. The Georgian Government had been transferred hither from Kutais, the remnant of the Georgian army, reduced now to 4,000 men, lay outside the town, and Turkish troops were in occupation of the town itself. Further Georgian resistance being futile, an armistice was proclaimed on the 14th March.

March 17 1921 Peace Signed between Georgia and Russia

On the 17th March peace was signed between the Georgian Government and the Bolsheviks, under which the Bolsheviks were invited to occupy the town and province of Batoum, notwithstanding that a similar offer had been made to and accepted by the Turks, who were now in occupation.

Fighting at Batoum between Georgians and Turks

The result was that on the 17th March fighting broke out between the Georgians and Turks for possession of the town, and continued until evening without decisive result. On the 18th March a truce was arranged between the Turkish and Georgian forces until definite orders should be received from the Governments at Moscow and Angora. The members of the Georgian Government and several commanders then left for Constantinople by sea, and a Georgian Soviet Republic was proclaimed. In the end the Turkish troops were withdrawn from Batoum.

March 19 Withdrawal of the British Mission from Transcaucasia

On peace being concluded between the Georgian Government and the Bolsheviks the withdrawal of the British mission to Transcaucasia became necessary. Colonel Stokes, the Chief British Commissioner in Transcaucasia, together with his staff therefore evacuated Batoum on the 19th March, and official intercourse between Great Britain and the Transcaucasian States ceased.

The Treaty of Kars a matter more for the Documentary History of Recent Events in Turkey

From this point onwards little reliable information upon events in Transcaucasia is available. Much has happened, but there is much obscurity. It does not seem, therefore, to attempt, in an historical paper based upon official documents, a continuation of the story up to the conclusion of the Treaty of Kars, though the execution of that instrument marks the logical point at which a review of recent Transcaucasian history should close. And, further, although the completion of the Treaty of Kars is an event of great importance to the republics of Transcaucasia, as representing the consummation of Bolshevik and Turkish policy in these regions, yet a detailed account of the treaty and its implications falls more conveniently within the scope of a history of events in Turkey. It is proposed, therefore, to deal with the Treaty of Kars at length in the history of recent events in the Ottoman Empire now in course of preparation.

But in order that the overthrow of the independent republics of Transcaucasia shall not appear here as a story incomplete, a few words may be given to events immediately following the conclusion of peace between Georgia and the Bolsheviks.

CONCLUSION—The Transcaucasian Republics under Soviet Rule

Bolshevik Methods in Georgia

In her handling of the Georgian problem with which she found herself confronted, Bolshevik Russia adopted other courses than those she had followed in Azerbaijan and Armenia. She contrived no internal revolution followed by an invitation to herself to come in and take control of reconstruction. She chose instead direct military aggression, though making an attempt that her operations, at least in their earlier stages, should appear as revolutionary action by the Soviet Republics of Armenia and Azerbaijan. There remains, however, the incontrovertible fact that, if the initial aggression was not by Russia, it was the Russian army which overthrew the Georgian Republic, and forced upon the people a Soviet Government to which they were opposed. By these means Georgia was again brought into the position of a Russian province.

But the conquest once achieved, the Russian authorities displayed remarkable tact in avoiding all unnecessary offence to Georgian national susceptibilities. A Georgian Communist Party already existed, upon the council of which in January 1921 a treaty was signed by the Russian and Georgian Governments. No use was made of this organisation, it was ignored, and the Georgians were invited to form their own Government on Soviet lines. This they did and called it Bolshevik, and it was not until August 1921, when the well known Georgian Bolshevik Budu Mdvaniani, whom we have seen on a Bolshevik mission to Angora, took charge of Georgian affairs, that any Russian official appeared in the Georgian Administration.

March 16, 1921. Treaty of Moscow between Russia and Turkey

During the time that Armenia and Georgia were being reduced to Soviet rule, an important conference, between representatives of Russia and Nationalist Turkey, was sitting at Moscow. The conference eventually resulted in a Treaty of Moscow, signed on the 16th March, 1921, by which the two contracting States were brought into a more binding and definite alliance than ever, the conference also settled, as between Russia and Turkey, certain territorial questions in Transcaucasia.

Recognition of the National Pact by Russia

By this Agreement the two Governments bound themselves to refuse recognition to any other arrangement which might be made by the Turkish Government with the frontiers of Turkey as those laid down in the National Pact, adopted by the Turkish Chamber of Deputies on the 24th January, 1920, but added to the Turkish territory, so defined, a part of the Province of Batoum, and the whole of the two Armenian districts of Ardahan and Kars. The treaty further assigned the port and town of Batoum to Georgia on certain conditions, and the disputed district of Nachichevan to Azerbaijan, but as an autonomous province. The independence of the Caucasian States was certainly though indirectly recognised in the treaty, but Russia reserved paternal rights over them whereby she undertook to ensure the acceptance of the treaty by the individual republics.

June 1921. Old Governments of the Transcaucasian Republics exile themselves to Paris.—Agreement for Transcaucasian Federation signed in Paris.

On June 1921, these refugees, including self-appointed representatives of the non-existent Republic of Daghestan, made an Agreement in which, regarding themselves as adequate sponsors of the representative Governments of their several countries, they formed a confederation of the four Caucasian States. The signatories were officially received by the French Government, who also recognised the Agreement.

Origin of the Agreement

It might appear that this singular performance could have had no other purpose than to show the *Entente* the willingness of the Caucasian States for confederation had not the overpowering force of circumstances prevented their Governments adopting that policy at the time it was urged upon them. Such a view would, indeed, be merely a charitable view. The fact is that the Agreement was instigated by certain French statesmen with very definite aims before them—General Denikin and Wrangel, and securing for Russia the return of her former frontiers. These changed French aims seem to have been adopted when General Wrangel's campaign had definitely failed.

1921 Action of the French Government in controlling the Finances of the Transcaucasian Federation.

The considerable financial means necessary for maintaining in Paris the representatives of the Confederated States of Transcaucasia were adroitly provided and controlled by the French Government without cost to the French Exchequer. The Azerbaijan representatives had brought all available State monies to Paris. The Georgian representatives had escaped with very little money, but with the greater part of the Georgian State treasure. The French Government placed an embargo on these Azerbaijan and Georgian national reserves, but allowed the representatives a certain fixed income, which could, of course, be withheld at any moment if any recalcitrancy were shown. The Armenian representatives were supported by their own people and societies, and therefore were more or less free of French control. The Armenians, apparently, displayed the greatest reluctance to binding themselves by the Agreement.

French and American Oil Interests involved. Intrigues of Nationalists

It has transpired further that French and American oil interests had a considerable influence in procuring the execution of the so called Caucasian Federal Agreement. Both the Azerbaijan and Georgian representatives had several secret interviews with a certain group of French Nationalist Deputies before signing. It is further reported on good authority that the Turkish Nationalists are bearing a part in these intrigues, and that Bekir Sami Bey has made tentative proposals to the French Government, urging them to support the anti Bolshevik elements in Azerbaijan and Georgia with the ultimate purpose of bringing Caucasus under Turkish protection when Bolshevism should have lost power. In return for such intelligent French support Turkey would then ensure that to France should go concessions for exploiting the oil deposits of Azerbaijan.

So it appears that the Agreement was not only imposed upon the light of the Franco-Turkish Agreement of Angora. But after all, the destinies of the Caucasus are in the hands of the French Government.

W J CHILDS
A E R McDONELL

Foreign Office May 31 1922

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE.

One Document, being map showing various frontiers of Turkey and the three Trans-Caucasian Republics and the districts in dispute between the republics

has been removed to

Min 218

22. 2

1922. 218

As a result of enquiries made by the Government of the Jews, it was found that the Jews would welcome such missions of enquiry if only those missions would publish their

7. Jazot Pasha said that the Armenians were equally to blame, and had committed atrocities on their side. He went so far as to say that certain Armenian leaders had deliberately provoked Armenian massacres for their own ends. An example of

enquiring the reason he was informed that the officer's whole family had been murdered by Armenians. A friend of his, a man of 70, had likewise been killed by Armenians.

CHAPTER II.—TURKEY.

E 305 5 44]

No. 3.

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received January 9, 1921)

Constantinople, December 31, 1921

[PAID] a visit to Izzet Pasha, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, to-day.

One of the objects of my visit was to define to him my attitude towards Hamid Bey, who, as your Lordship is aware, is the unofficial Nationalist agent at Constantinople. Hamid Bey recently visited General Harrington's headquarters, and stated that he was authorized by the Angora Government to "talk to the British." The officer who saw Hamid Bey very properly informed the latter that whatever he had to say should be said to myself. I thereupon took advantage of a message which I wished to convey to Hamid Bey in connection with the recent prisoners' exchange agreement to let him know that there had been nothing in the Henry Mission, and that I was the proper medium of communication between the Angora Government and His Majesty's Government. I let Hamid Bey know that I had no statement to make to him pending the meeting of the three Foreign Ministers at Paris, but that if he wished to say anything to me I was ready to receive him for that purpose.

I therefore informed Izzet Pasha that, just as I had explained to him at the last Major Henry had no mission of any sort either from His Majesty's Government or General Harrington, so I had thought it well to make the same statement to him, adding that I was the only medium of communication at Constantinople between the Turks and His Majesty's Government.

1. His Highness then alluded to the forthcoming meeting of the Allied Foreign Ministers at Paris. He wondered what the procedure would be and whether a conference would be held at Paris.

5. I replied that I imagined that that would be the procedure. Izzet Pasha said that he had heard rumours that the proposed conference might take place at Constantinople. There have been rumours to this effect for some time past in this city. I replied that I had heard these rumours. I enquired how Izzet Pasha viewed Constantinople as the meeting place for the conference. He seemed to be in favour of it, but said that the Nationalists might make some difficulties, though he thought that they would be obliged.

6. He then went on to talk about minorities in Turkey, and alluded to the recent meeting at the Mansion House. He said that it was evident that the British nation was apprehensive regarding the safety of minorities under Turkish rule and mistrusted the Turks in this respect. I replied that he ought not to be surprised at this mistrust, having regard to the Armenian massacres, which had horrified the world by their cruelty. Izzet Pasha then developed a theme which I have heard from British Ministers, namely, that the minorities had in the past lived contented and happy in Turkey for several centuries. He pointed out that at the time when the Inquisition was flourishing in Spain Christian minorities were not suffering from persecution in Turkey. I said that events which had occurred in recent years had anyhow quite shaken the faith of Western nations in Turkish tolerance, and that it would be necessary to have real guarantees for the protection of minorities. Western Powers had shown great interest in minorities in Europe. Thus, while I had been in Poland, two official missions, one American and one British, had been sent to Poland to enquire into the treatment of the Jews. Izzet Pasha said that the Turks would welcome such missions of enquiry if only these missions would publish their findings. They had not done so in the case of the exiles at Yalova and Ghunlek.

7. Izzet Pasha said that the Armenians were equally to blame, and had committed deliberately provoked Armenian massacres for their own ends. As examples of Armenian atrocities, he quoted the case of a member of his staff at the time when he was commanding an army against the Russians in the second year of the war. He had noticed that the officer in question was always silent and seemed very dejected. On enquiring the reason he was informed that the officer's whole family had been murdered by Armenians. A friend of his, a man of 70, had likewise been killed by Armenians.

8. I admitted that the Armenians had no doubt committed a certain number of excesses, but these excesses could not be compared for one moment with the massacres and deportations of which the Turks had been guilty. It had been computed that nearly 1,000,000 Armenians had perished as the result of these massacres, &c.

9. Izzet Pasha asked on what evidences Lord Bryce's report was based. I said that there was a great mass of evidence of an unimpeachable character, and quoted the testimony of Dr. Lepsius, who, having regard to the policy of his country towards Turkey at the time, must be considered as an impartial witness. Izzet Pasha tried to argue that the Armenian population in Turkey at the beginning of the war had not exceeded 800,000. I replied that, though off-hand give statistics of the Armenian population in Turkey, I thought that his figure was mistaken, and that there must have been fully 1½ million Armenians in Turkey proper.

10. On taking leave of Izzet Pasha, I said that I hoped that the New Year would bring peace to this part of the world.

I have, &c.
HORACE RUMBOLD.
High Commissioner

E 311 311 44

No 4

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston — (Received January 9)

No 13.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 3, 1922.

I HAVE the honour to forward to you herewith the annual report on the heads of missions at Constantinople.

2. I have rewritten this report.

I have, &c.
HORACE RUMBOLD.
High Commissioner

Enclosure in No. 1

Annual Report on Heads of Missions at Constantinople

High Commissioners

GENERAL PELLÉ, who is a man of sixty and looks even older, came to Constantinople as Ambassador at Madrid. General Pellé had been at the head of the French Military Mission in Czechoslovakia before his appointment as French High Commissioner at Constantinople. He had also, I believe, served as Chief of the Staff to Marshal Joffre early in the war.

General Pellé is a hard working man with a clear head. He did not take long to get to know the High Commissioners. He presides at the High Commissioners' meetings when these are held at the French Embassy. He has always shown himself conciliatory at these meetings, and when any question of a particularly controversial nature is likely to arise he has dominated the question with his knowledge in order to avoid controversy at the meeting itself. He has only once to my knowledge forwarded an inaccurate report to his Government, and this was in connection with a special meeting held by the three High Commissioners on the occasion of the so-called plot last summer against the army of occupation here, he considered General Charpy as his direct subordinate, an arrangement which I believe does not please General Charpy. General Pellé appears to seize every opportunity of making speeches, and the requisite publicity is given to these speeches owing to the French having a propaganda organ of their own. General Pellé tends to play up to the Turks, or at least poses as their friend in public. He is anti-Greek.

When he first came here General Pellé had the services of M. de Chambrun, a remarkably intelligent career diplomatist. M. de Chambrun left some little time ago,

and General Pellé is very understaffed, with the result that he is swamped with detail and has the appearance of being overworked.

General Pellé recently married a Czechoslovak lady.

On the whole, I am well satisfied with General Pellé as a colleague, and I like him very much.

General Pellé is a man of nearly 70 years of age, and is a political "boss" in his own country. He was Prefect of Genoa for fifteen years, and I think was created a marquis by his friend Signor Giolitti. He is a Senator. The Marquis Garioni informed me on one occasion that the Italian Ambassadors at Berlin and Washington were his friends. General Pellé, he thought, would remain long in the diplomatic service, as they had too many interests in Italy.

At High Commissioners' conferences he sometimes appears to be half asleep, and is often very stubborn and difficult to deal with. He is often very stubborn and difficult to deal with, and my French colleague and I have to be careful not to be rushed by him into decisions by which he hopes Italian interests may benefit.

I think that my Italian colleague generally takes a sound view of affairs here, and has certainly shown every wish to cooperate with the French. He has caused a flutter in diplomatic circles by attempting to force his daughter into the position of Ambassador by giving her precedence over wives of Ministers.

Japan

Mr. Uchida came here in the spring of last year. He had been Minister at Constantinople for some time, and was trying to play a part, and, having failed to do so, rushed into intervention with the Turks without in the least understanding Turkish mentality. It was soon clear that he was an intermediary between the Nationalists and even the Turkish Government, to the advantage of both. His efforts in this direction were embarrassing, and I have done my best to discountenance them.

Mr. Uchida has also made somewhat indignant attempts from time to time to obtain previous communication of the agenda of the High Commissioners' meetings, so he said, to see for himself whether the High Commissioners were going to discuss any questions affecting Japanese interests. My Allied colleagues and I have, however, formally declined to give way on this point. Mr. Uchida, however, has been in the uniform of a Japanese officer. Mr. Uchida is certainly a high class Japanese.

United States

Admiral Bristol, the United States High Commissioner, came here early in 1919. He has therefore been here longer than any of the High Commissioners. Before I arrived here he was described to me by the American Naval Attaché in London as a man of "transparent candour." I have always found him friendly, and certainly in one case, in which an American citizen and the British military authorities were concerned, conciliatory. I am under the impression, however, that he is, or was, inclined to be jealous of the fact that the Allied High Commissioners are practically directing the administration of Constantinople.

The first few months after my arrival here, Admiral Bristol used to take every opportunity to allude to the oil policy of His Majesty's Government. He professed to believe that the British Empire was up against America in the oil question, and did not hesitate on occasion to hint that Great Britain owed America nearly 1,000,000,000, and that, in view of this fact, Americans could not easily understand the desire of the British Government to secure monopolies for themselves in mandated territories. But it is only a matter of time before the American position will be changed.

There was perhaps a genuine feeling in his mind that the Allied High Commissioners disregarded American trade interests. On the other hand, the Allied High Commissioners were entitled to think that Admiral Bristol was purposely obstructing their efforts to obtain relief for the Turkish Exchequer. I think this misunderstanding has now been cleared away with the result that Admiral Bristol is infinitely more conciliatory and pleasant to deal with.

M. Votas, who commanded one of the Greek ships here, was appointed Greek High Commissioner early last year in succession to M. Canedopoulos. The post of Greek representative here must be difficult at any time, but it is especially so just now. Under the present Greek Government the Greek High Commissioner must necessarily be the bulk of the Greek colony here in sympathy. Prior to the recent election of the Greek Patriarch, there had been a rapprochement between the Greek High Commissioner and the Patriarchate. This rapprochement is now at an end, in view of the failure of the Greek High Commissioner to influence the election of the Patriarch.

M. Votas has had absolutely no training for the post of Greek High Commissioner, and it is a pity that the Greek Government did not select a civilian with the necessary qualifications. The Turkish Government, having refused to recognize the Greek High Commissioner officially, correspondence between that High Commissioner and the Turkish Government passes through the Allied High Commissioners. M. Votas appears to be very hard working, and has often struck me as unable to sift and appraise the value of the representations which he receives. Thus there is always a risk of carrying much weight with his Government, and the representations which the Allied High Commissioners constantly have to make to him produce little or no effect.

The Vatican

Mgr. Dolci is the Apostolic delegate. He has now been at Constantinople some years, and eventually received a British decoration in recognition of his services in that direction. Mgr. Dolci is very friendly and pleasant, and, as is usually the case with Papal representatives, is a man of considerable intelligence. He was offered the post of Nunzio at Warsaw last year, when Mgr. Ratti vacated that post on his return to the Cardinalate, but refused on account of the climate. He tells me that he intended for Brussels, but that the present incumbent did not wish to leave. I understand that Mgr. Dolci will shortly be transferred to Lisbon. The French look with some suspicion on the presence of an Apostolic delegate at Constantinople, and I noticed that my French colleague recently expressed some surprise when he heard that Mgr. Dolci had dined at this Embassy.

Latvians

Denmark

M. Wundt plays no part whatever, and is only seen at big parties.

Netherlands

and an agreeable colleague. At a post like this, where there are so few diplomats, it is pleasant to be able to discuss matters with a man like Baron Bengers. I understand that Baron Bengers made his social duties somewhat strenuous.

Spain

The Spanish Minister, M. Berce y Vea, is the doyen of the Ministers. He has spent most of his career in South America, and finds this climate somewhat trying. Owing to the difficulty of finding suitable accommodation in Constantinople itself, he lives rather an isolated life at Ik-yak Dere, where he spends the whole year. He is a quiet man of literary tastes.

M. Wallenberg realized on his arrival that he was under suspicion of having been very pro-German during the war. The fact that he is in charge of German interests

suspicion, but he works hard to dispel the legend that he is Germanophile. After the conclusion of the prisoners exchange agreement with the Angora Government some of the returned Turks did not hesitate to state in the Nationalist press that they had been badly treated at Malta and had suffered indignities there. M. Wallenberg procured a report from the Swedish consul at Malta on the treatment of the Turks. This report was very favourable to the British authorities, and M. Wallenberg lost no time in communicating it to the Turkish Government. His wife is a good-natured lady, who pours forth an unending stream of talk in a somewhat strident voice, which is somewhat tiresome.

Delegates

Belgium

M. Michotte de Welle was Belgian Minister of War. His personal effects there were plundered, whilst his property in Belgium was likewise stripped, and his wife lost her family possessions in France. These misfortunes have not prevented him from accepting the post of Belgian delegate to the League of Nations, which until recently was sparsely furnished. He has now commenced to receive. He states that he has a considerable amount of work to do, presumably in connection with the electric light and two-way companies, which are Belgian concerns. He is very bitter about the Italian High Commissioner for insisting that his daughter-in-law should take precedence of Mme. Michotte de Welle.

Czechoslovakia

The Czechoslovakian delegate is a M. Svoblik married to an English lady. He is a quiet people and not much seen about. M. Svoblik strikes me as an intelligent man.

Poland

M. Baranowski is the Polish delegate. He was employed on propaganda work in Switzerland during a part of the war, and was afterwards at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Warsaw. He has quite a number of Polish subjects in and around Constantinople, including the Polish farming colony situated in Anatolia, several miles from the entrance of the Black Sea. He gives receptions, which are very dull affairs, and is evidently keen on playing a part socially.

Romania

M. Filaschi is the Roumanian delegate. I have heard that he has been absent at Warsaw negotiating with the Polish representative. He is presumably a man of some ability or else the Roumanian Government would not have selected him for that purpose.

M. Chapoutel is the S. H. S. delegate. He is little seen about, but I suspect that he plays a larger part politically than the delegates of other countries.

E 312 312 44

No. 5

Sir H. Russell to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston — (Received January 9.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 3, 11

With reference to your Lordship's despatch No. 1400 of the 20th December, 1921, relative to Mahmud Mukhtar Pasha, I have the honour to report the following facts which have not hitherto seemed of sufficient importance to be brought to your notice. Mahmud Mukhtar Pasha, who, as your Lordship is aware, was Turkish Ambassador in Berlin before and during the first portion of the war, has spent most of his time since the war in Switzerland. He formed one of the not very coherent group of Turkish exiles who were active on any side in Turkish internal politics. Ferid Pasha made a strong effort to induce him to join the Turkish Peace Delegation in Paris in 1920, but Mukhtar Pasha firmly refused.

2. Mahmud Mukhtar Pasha returned to Constantinople some months ago for the purpose of settling his affairs.

have no objection to Mukhar Pasha being allowed private business but that, if an application were made, it would have to be dealt with in the ordinary way.

my definite request for assistance in obtaining permission to interview it came to my knowledge that the Sultan had himself decided the pasha should see me, but this was represented as being merely an attempt on the Majesty's part to get rid of the pasha's importunity.

all Turkish subjects wishing to travel abroad. It does not in any way bind the passport authorities of the country of destination and Mahmud Mukhtar Fasha has not, so far, approached the British passport control.

for some weeks past that I am unfavourably disposed towards the present Cabinet, and it now looks as though I were credited with a wish to bring Mahmud Muhtar Pasha into office.

* to interference were not a fixed rule of the Maori's

It is definitely anti-Kemalist Government, is casting about with great caution for a third Visier unconnected with either side in the struggle between the Kemalists and anti-Kemalists, and that Mukhtar Pasha is attracted by the idea of taking office, but is also, on his side, displaying great caution. The Sultan would like any new Grand Vizier, and doubtless feel much more disposed to accept office if he could hope that His Majesty's Government would show benevolence towards Turkey during the future peace negotiations.

I have, &c

JOURNAL OF RESEARCH

High Commissioner

E 313 313 44]

No. 8.

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston - (Received January 9)

No. 103

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 3, 1922.

I HAVE the honour to report a minor incident which illustrates the increasing difficulty of avoiding discussion in the Allied camp here.

2. I had observed that the French point of view in the submarine controversy was being widely advertised in the local press a few days ago. When Mr. Ballou's explicit

unique Havana Renter bulletin had been received
previous day by his French colleague at the instance of the French High C
l at once informed Renter's agent that he would give my support in assisting
publication, and a translation of the statement duly appeared in the bulletin of the
2nd January.

of the controversy over the Franklin-Bouillon Agreement, collaborated very loyally with me.

... of the two Governments in a deal affecting the Near East
question was, I pointed out,

to attempt to conceal every disagreement between Great Britain and France, and as great pains had been taken to explain the French view to the local public, I must insist that the British view should also be made known. I agreed to two modifications in the French version, which, without altering Mr Baillur's language more than could be accounted for by freedom of translation, attenuated it somewhat. I agreed also to some purely verbal alterations not affecting the sense. On this being reported to General Follen, he suggested a further modification, which would have altered materially what Mr Baillur said, and to which I therefore refused to assent. I was evidently not prepared to do so. I was not prepared to do so in the Committee's Committee.

1 June, Dec

HOLLY HESBOLD

High Commissioner,

E 414 5 341

No 7

Sir P. Lorraine to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received January 11, 1922.)

(No. - Confidential)

My Lord,

Received, December 11, 1921.

I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith a memorandum summarizing, so far as I can, a long conversation which I had yesterday with His

* Not printed.

Majesty the King of Irak
 character

view was of an entirely private

I have handed a copy of the enclosed memorandum to His Majesty's High

I have &c
 PERCY DORRANCE

Enclosure in

*Memorandum of an unofficial Interview with His Majesty King Faisal, dated
 December 10 1921.*

ON the evening of my arrival at Bagdad I had the honor
 Irak at dinner with the British High Commissioner
 to invite me to call on him in his own residence
 which was present at this interview

I enquired of King Faisal whether he had any recent news in regard to the
 situation in Persia and what he thought of the present state of affairs in that country.
 His Majesty replied that news reached him from time to time, but not through any
 regular channel, he understood that at the moment, there were only two people who
 counted for anything, and they were the Prime Minister, Karam-Saltan
 Minister of War, Reza Khan, that the latter was in a strong position owing
 personal command of all the available forces, but he doubted whether he
 trusted to use his power wisely as he was an ignorant and uneducated
 Majesty said that British policy had no doubt had a set-back

Persians of the Anglo-Persian Agreement. He thought
 wants had been lacking in wisdom in this respect, but the principal blame lay
 with the Ulema and the Mujtahid, both at Korbela and Najaf and in Persia. These
 men he considered as the greatest bar to any progress in Persia, and they wielded
 unscrupulously a most pernicious influence, generally used to thwart every effort made

and the Ulema made it their business to maintain their fellow-countrymen
 which was the most favourable one for the continuance of their own
 authority and influence. As things were it was quite easy for them to say that any

people, and such fetters
 weight. The Ulema were well aware that any progress
 was a direct menace to their authority, and they had, therefore, systematic
 every attempt in this direction. Moreover, the members of the ruling class
 who held the various offices of State, really worked in accord with the
 had in common with them an interest in preserving the present conditions and opposing
 real progress. His Majesty expressed strongly the opinion that until the influence of
 the Ulema was broken no satisfactory progress could be made in Persian affairs.

I enquired by what means His Majesty thought that this result might be obtained,
 work, almost certainly defeat their own object, as any
 matters would arouse the susceptibilities of all classes of Moslems
 sentiment. King Faisal agreed with this view and said he thought there were two
 methods which might be employed. One was to start as many schools as possible in
 Persia and obtain facilities for Persians to get a liberal education, the other was to
 involve the Ulema among themselves. His Majesty said that we had done something
 this direction, especially as regards education, both in Egypt and India, and he

this was indeed the case, but that the British had been handicapped in their task for
 the reasons which I had previously explained, and especially because, as His Majesty
 was well aware, the British Government had at all times been particular
 in avoiding any measures likely to arouse or offend Moslem religious
 seemed to me that His Majesty and his advisers had in this count

for carrying out a scheme of liberal education and enlightenment, as then
 it would not be open to any shadow of the suspicion which similar action by a
 foreign authority might arouse, and it seemed to me that if His Majesty could bring
 about the creation of a great and liberal Moslem University in Bagdad he would be
 doing a great work and one which would be of incalculable benefit to the Moslems

world. King Faisal said he hoped that something
 be accomplished, and he agreed entirely that the
 more favourable one than any that had occurred hitherto, besides ordinary
 he was very keen on the development of the arts and sciences among his
 low-countrymen, these were the best cures for both ignorance and
 knowledge spread the baneful influence of the clergy would proportionately diminish,
 moreover, if such a project could be carried out it would most

In fact, His Majesty went on to say, he thought that our position in Persia
 a considerable extent, depend on the wisdom and liberality of the policy
 which we adopted towards Irak. If the Persians saw Irak rapidly progressing as
 a modern and enlightened State, aided by the
 Government, they would at

and the ones pro-
 as one they would realize that the British participation in that development was
 a really disinterested one, and that it had been a great mistake for Persia to refuse
 our proffered assistance. In the
 of Persians who had, at the time, been opponents of the Anglo-Persian Agreement,
 and even, perhaps, in the minds of some of the Mujtahids themselves, though they
 would not go so far as to avow it. He was inclined to think that the ordinary
 population was realizing that our withdrawal had only been succeeded by disorder
 and insecurity, where security had before prevailed and money was plentiful

at the door of the Persian rather than at that of the

conversation then turned on the Turkish question, and His Majesty dwelt with
 considerable feeling on the policy pursued by France. He condemned the Franco-
 Kemalist Agreement as a national act and one which was entirely contrary to the
 Treaty of Sevres. However that might be, His Majesty continued, French policy in
 Asia seemed to him to be frankly hostile to Great Britain, and France seemed to be
 securing successes all along the line owing to the absence, so far as he could see, of any
 clear and definite policy on the part of His Majesty's Government towards the Turkish
 question and towards the Islamic world in general. He understood the difficulties of
 Majesty's Government and that the facts as regards their policy were after a quite
 different from what was represented in this part of the world. It was, nevertheless,
 the case that the population in general, judging from what
 that Great Britain stood behind the Greeks, who were Christian
 backing the Turks, who were Moslems, and the conclusion was that Great Britain
 abandoned her traditional attitude of friendliness towards Islamic States. His Majesty
 added that he was speaking quite personally, and with complete frankness, he, of

how much damage they were doing to British interests. Were he an Englishman he
 thought he would have quarrelled with France long ago. His patience with her would
 have been exhausted. I ventured to remind His Majesty that there were Western as
 well as Eastern problems, and that a breach with France involved the virtual collapse
 of the whole system embodied in the Treaty of Versailles, a result which hardly any-
 one could desire.

At the close of the war, His Majesty continued, Great Britain had a strong
 position in the East. Her arms had been everywhere victorious, and she stood without

gained seemed to be being frittered away. I told His Majesty that I should under-
 stand that point of view if gain in the East had been our object, but once our enemies
 had been overthrown I could not see what we had stood to gain except the safeguarding
 of our existing interests, the restoration of peaceful conditions and the promotion
 of order and prosperity, with such assistance as we could afford, in the regions freed
 from Turkish misrule. His Majesty said that all would have been well if we had

that clear from the outset, but he feared that we had not, and that the uncertainty
 prevailing in everyone's mind as regards our intentions was exercising a bad influence.
 Quite apart from the question of gain, we had more to lose in the East than any other
 Power, and it seemed to him that we were standing by while our position was being
 attacked from several quarters. Everyone was puzzled to know what our real
 intentions were. I expressed the opinion that the real drag on the situation was
 the absence, as yet, of any solution of the Kemalist-Turk question, and I very much
 hoped that, now that such a happy issue had been found out of the negotiations on the
 Irish question, His Majesty's Government might be able to concentrate a greater share

the problem bristled with difficulties. I had no doubt, however, that a settlement would be ultimately reached and felt convinced that its entry into force would have a pacifying and salutary effect in many directions, the benefit of which would be likewise felt in Tehran.

I was struck by the manner in which King Faisal evidently thinks out himself the problems which come under his notice, and also by the breadth of his views as regards education and enlightenment. He did not seem to me to have any axe to grind, but there could be no doubt as regards the great earnestness of his plea that a sagacious generosity should guide the policy of His Majesty's Government in the formation of the new Turkish State. His Majesty's attitude was frank, friendly and cordial. At the conclusion of the interview he was so good as to wish me a safe journey to Tehran and success in the mission which had been entrusted to me there.

PELCOY TORRINE

December 11, 1922

E 527 5 44

No. 8

Mr. Lindley to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received January 14)

No. 7. (Confidential)

My Lord,

Athens, January 6, 1922

I HAVE the honour to report that, whilst I was in Rome on my way post, the Marquis della Torretta, who was my colleague both in Russia and Vienna, had a conversation after dinner the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs developed his views on the Greco-Turkish question at considerable length. Before leaving Rome I had a conversation with the Marquis della Torretta, but it may be of interest to put it on record in greater detail.

The Marquis della Torretta began by saying that he believed his views coincided closely with those of your Lordship. The important thing was to restore peace in the East, and to re-establish the Turkish Government at Constantinople, where it would be more amenable to pressure from the side of the Allies than in the fastnesses of the interior. It was also essential to reinforce the authority of the Sultan.

These objects could not be obtained so long as the Greeks were in Asia Minor and the Greek zone in Thrace came so near the capital as the Chataldja lines. It would therefore be necessary for the Greeks to evacuate Smyrna and to withdraw sufficiently far from Constantinople to free the capital from the constant menace of a military descent. So long as this was done he did not care how much or how little of Thrace was retained by the Greeks.

The Minister went on to say that it was impossible for the Allies to assent to the abrogation of the Capitulations, but they might agree to some modifications which would remedy the undoubted abuses which had gradually grown up in their practical application.

of financial control established. He saw little advantage in military control, since every Turk was a trained soldier, and paper restrictions in this direction would merely cause difficulties with the Turks without offering real safeguards against an expansion of the army.

At this point I drew the Minister's attention to the intractable mood now prevailing at Angora, and the disinclination of the Turks to abate one jot of the national pact. He replied that the Turks were in a very elated state and Signor Torretta was so unfavourable for his conversations that the Minister had recalled him. He might arrive at Rome any day. Nevertheless, it was necessary to make peace in the Near East, and some way must be found out of the present situation. The question of the recognition of King Constantine must be settled at the same time. The only thing was to find a formula which, while respecting the will of the Greek people, would save the face of the Allies and put an end to the existing ridiculous and undignified state of things.

The above conversation was understood by both sides to be of a purely private nature. The Marquis della Torretta would be ready to go to any lengths in making concessions to the Turks if

peace could be thereby attained. I do not believe that he would, in the last resort, stand out either for the Capitulations or financial control, much less for any cessation of Thrace to Greece.

I am forwarding a copy of this despatch by bag to His Majesty's Ambassador at Rome.

I have, &c

F. O. LINDLEY

E 528/5/44

No. 9

Mr. Lindley to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received January 14)

(No. 11)

My Lord,

Athens, January 7, 1922

I HAVE the honour to report that, whilst I was in Athens, I called on MM. Gounaris and Baltazzi, who were staying in the capital. I explained to them that I had no instructions to speak to them on political matters, but that I was glad to take the opportunity to make their acquaintance. I was going out in exactly the same capacity as Lord Curzon, and had a letter addressed by your Lordship to the Greek Minister. After reading it, with my Lordship's permission, in reply to questions from the two Ministers, I stated that, speaking as a private person who had heard a good deal of talk from different sides, I felt pretty certain that no settlement with the Turks was possible so long as the Greeks remained in Asia Minor. I advised them, therefore, to get accustomed to the idea of a withdrawal. They asked, in reply, what would then happen to the Christian populations in the district. I presumed that the Powers would make the necessary arrangements.

2. During my second interview with M. Protopapadakis, the Acting Prime Minister at Athens, I held much the same language, as it seems to me necessary that those in authority here should have time to prepare public opinion for what will, if it comes about, be a bitter pill to swallow. M. Protopapadakis, like M. Gounaris, asked me what would happen to the Christian populations, and I replied as I had done to his chief. Neither the one nor the other seemed to me to be taken aback by the suggestion of evacuation, which they had probably already heard often enough before, and there have been certain signs during the last two days that public opinion is to be carefully prepared beforehand.

3. It would be presumptuous on my part, after a few days at my post, to hazard any personal opinion as to the effect of such an evacuation on the internal political situation. I have questioned a good many persons whose judgment commands respect, and they all seem to think that it would be a serious blow to the country, but without dangerous effervescence. Both the Venizelists and their opponents would make capital out of the withdrawal. The former would declare that, but for the return of King Constantine, Greek aspirations in Asia Minor would have been fulfilled. The latter would point to the withdrawal as definite proof of the disastrous results of following the policy of Venizelos. In short, it seems probable that the evacuation would supply about the same quantity of ammunition—or mud—to both parties and would leave their relative strength about the same.

4. The effect which might be produced by evacuation on the army of Asia Minor is more important. It is quite impossible to form any useful judgment regarding it. An English acquaintance of mine told me to-day that he questioned a number of Greek privates on leave from Asia Minor a few days ago in the train. They were ready enough to complain of everything, but, when he suggested that it was time to go home, they all said that they would go. On the other hand, many of the people will tell you that the army of Asia Minor is completely weary of the campaign and would willingly forgo their ideal of a Greater Greece in return for peace. On the other hand, many of the officers and men have decided to take a leaf out of the book of Zeligowski and Kemal, and will refuse to leave Asia Minor if ordered to do so.

5. In June of last year Colonel Hoare Nairne, military attaché to the Legation, visited the Greek army in Asia Minor and made a most interesting report on its moral and its military efficiency (see telegram written by Colonel Nairne from Smyrna to your Lordship for the C. I. G. S. and dated the 15th June, and referred to

in Constantinople telegram No. 447 of the 22nd June). I have been carefully through the archives, and that is the last report which is of any value to this Legation from the political point of view. Lord Granville suggested that further visit might be made to other districts. I have been allowed to visit Smyrna. I am aware that British officers from Constantinople are with the Greek forces, and they keep the military attaché regularly informed of military events. But the Greek army is part of the Greek nation—perhaps the most important and most politically active part—and yet the Legation is cut off from all direct knowledge of what is happening in it. This seems a most extraordinary state of affairs, and I have asked Colonel Nairne, who leaves for London with this despatch, to take the matter up as soon as he arrives home.

6. While unable myself to form any opinion as to the state of the Asia Minor army, I venture to warn your Lordship against accepting, as accurate, views which emanate either from Venizelist sources in Constantinople or European residents in Smyrna. The former are completely unreliable as regards political feeling and the latter are, and always have been, just as biased against the Greeks as are all European residents in the China ports biased against the Japanese. I would particularly call your Lordship's attention to the fact that, as regards the military

who have studied that army is alone of any value. Colonel Nairne's report above mentioned is a typical instance of a British officer's report contradicting in vital particulars reports from other sources, which has been thoroughly justified by events.

become of paramount importance to form a correct estimate of what the Greek army is able, if given the material and moral support of the Allies or of Great Britain. I hope that His Majesty's Government will not base their judgment upon reports from anyone save from British officers thoroughly acquainted with Greek peculiarities.

7. Although I have thought it well to prepare the Greek Government for the possibility of sacrifices in Asia Minor, I have made no mention of Thrace. Some people aver that the loss of Smyrna would be a more severe blow to Hellenism than that of Thrace. This may be the case, but it is certain that the loss of both would be disastrous. In this despatch I mentioned the possibility of a Greek Zeligowski in Asia Minor. In that country it would be difficult for such an adventurer to maintain himself, but in Thrace it would be a simple matter, and, should the bulk of the new province be taken from the Greeks, we must be prepared for a recrudescence of that band of activity and general unrest in the Balkan Peninsula which has preceded and been the immediate cause of so many wars. After all that has passed in this part of the world, I do not believe that any Greek contemplates the possibility of having to renounce Thrace, and it seems inconceivable that the reinstatement of the Turk should be seriously contemplated. The loss of Thrace, which has been formally annexed, would produce consequences of the utmost gravity in Greece, and would in all probability compromise its whole future existence. Nevertheless, I do not doubt that the French will do all they can to effect this operation, and, as stated in my despatch No. 7 of the 8th instant, I do not anticipate that the Italians will offer any effective opposition to them.

I have &c.
F. O. LINDLEY

E 504 18 44)

No. 10

Lord Hardinge to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received January 14.)

(No. 123.)

HIS Majesty's Ambassador at Paris presents his compliments to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and has the honour to transmit herewith copy of a note from the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs, dated the 19th January, 1922, respecting Armenian refugees from Cilicia going to Constantinople.

Paris, January 13, 1922

Enclosure in No. 10

French Ministry for Foreign Affairs to Lord Hardinge.

DANS une note du 29 décembre dernier, l'Ambassade britannique a bien voulu exposer les raisons pour lesquelles le Général Harington estimerait inopportun de laisser les Arméniens de Cilicie venir s'établir à Constantinople. Elle a fait part en même temps au Ministère des Affaires étrangères du désir du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté que de nouveaux émigrants, venant de Cilicie notamment, ne soient plus autorisés à se rendre à Constantinople.

Le Président du Conseil, Ministre des Affaires étrangères, a l'honneur de faire savoir à son Excellence Lord Hardinge qu'il est d'accord pour estimer que l'afflux d'éléments nouveaux venant s'ajouter aux nombreux réfugiés de Constantinople présente de sérieux inconvénients. Mais il croit nécessaire de rappeler que les autorités françaises de Cilicie n'ont en rien encouragé les Arméniens de Cilicie à quitter ce pays et qu'elles se sont bornées, lorsque ces Arméniens ayant abandonné leur domicile se sont trouvés en détresse à Mersine et sur les confins de la Syrie, à mettre à leur disposition des moyens de transport pour se rendre en Syrie, où ils devaient trouver assistance. Elles se sont, par contre, abstenues de les diriger sur Constantinople. Leur intervention, loin de contribuer à créer la situation signalée par les Hauts-Commissaires et le Général Harington, n'a eu, par suite, pour effet que de l'atténuer en facilitant le transport vers la Syrie de la majorité des émigrants.

Paris, le 12 janvier 1922

E 810 314 44)

No. 11

Sir H. Humboldt to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received January 14.)

No. 65.

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 16, 1922.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 17 of the 4th January, relative to the recently concluded treaty between the Angora and Ukraine Governments, I have the honour to transmit herewith a translation of a much fuller version of the treaty which appeared (with the exception of certain numbered paragraphs, which have been included in the translation) in the "Waki" newspaper of the 9th January.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLDT,

High Commissioner.

Enclosure in No. 11

Extract from the "Waki" of January 9, 1922

TEXT OF THE TURCO-UKRAINIAN TREATY

ARTICLE 1

THE two contracting parties agree in principle not to recognise any peace treaty or other agreement concluded between Turkey and the Soviet Republic of Ukraine. The Government of the Socialist Soviet Republic of Ukraine agrees not to recognise any instrument relating to Turkey which has not been approved by the National Government of Ukraine as its sole representative in the Grand National Assembly. In this treaty, by "Turkey" is meant the territory as given in the national pact which was drawn up by the Chamber of Deputies assembled at Constantinople on the 28th January, 1920, and communicated by the press to all the Powers. The Ukrainian Government does not recognise the boundaries of Turkey as defined in articles 1 and 3 and annexes of the Turco-Russian Treaty of Friendship of the 16th March, 1921. Moreover, the Ukrainian Government undertakes to recognise the stipulations of every agreement reached between Turkey and the Soviet Republic of the

ARTICLE 2.

Turkey recognises as an independent and sovereign State the Socialist Soviet Republic of Ukraina, which was brought into being on territory of the former Russian Empire and which has a common frontier with the Allied Republic of Russia.

ARTICLE 3.

The two contracting parties agree that the treaties concluded up to the 16th March, 1921, between Turkey and the former Russian Empire or between Turkey and Ukraina, which were brought into being on territory of the former Russian Empire, that these treaties shall be null and non-existent. Ukraina, as having formed part of the former Russian Empire, declares that Turkey is free from every kind of financial or other obligation towards her based on international agreements concluded between Turkey and the Government of the Tsar.

ARTICLE 4.

With a view to assuring the freedom of passage of the Straits and their being open for the transport of the commerce of all nations, the two contracting parties agree to entrust the preparation of an international statute dealing with the Black Sea and the Straits to an international conference, which will shortly meet, on condition that the decisions of this conference in no way infringe the absolute sovereignty of Turkey or affect the security of Turkey and her capital, Constantinople.

ARTICLE 5.

The two contracting parties, as riverain States of the Black Sea, agree that no regulations shall be made in regard to the navigation of the Black Sea without their active participation. The two parties express the desire to co-operate by every means they consider fitting to obtain the recognition of their rights.

ARTICLE 6.

The two contracting parties undertake to prevent persons or organisations engaged in revolutionary activity in the territory of the other from entering into relations with persons or organisations residing in their territory. Turkey and Ukraina will enter into this undertaking with the Soviet Republics of Russia and the Caucasus on the basis of reciprocity. As regards this article, Turkish territory means the territory directly under the civil and military administration of the Government of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey.

ARTICLE 7.

The two contracting parties agreed to the application of "most-favoured-nation treatment" to the nationals of one of them residing in the territory of the other. This article shall not be applied to persons or organisations in alliance with Turkey or of Soviet Republics in alliance with Ukraina are concerned, nor will it be applied to commercial relations, which are to be regulated by a separate agreement.

ARTICLE 8.

The subjects of one of the two contracting parties residing in the territory of the other shall have the rights and duties determined by the laws of the country in which they reside. They will not, however, be subject to the laws and regulations relating to national defence. The nationals of both parties will be excepted from the stipulation of this article in matters relating to the law of the family and inheritance and to legal capacity. These matters will be dealt with by a special agreement.

ARTICLE 9.

Ukraina declares that she accepts and approves the stipulations of article 7 of the Russo-Russian Treaty of the 16th March, 1921, and article 3 of the Treaty of Kars of the 13th October, 1921, respecting the abolition of the "Ancient Treaties" (Capitulations) maintained by the so-called Capitulatory Powers.

ARTICLE 10.

It has been decided to conclude conventions respecting wireless telegraphical communication and posts and telegraphs and a consular convention.

ARTICLE 11.

Until the conclusion of the consular convention mentioned in article 10 the consuls-general, consuls and vice-consuls appointed by one of the two parties to towns, ports, and other places, shall be treated in accordance with general international law in matters relating to their privileges and functions and subject to reciprocity. The consent of the party concerned must be obtained to the appointment of consuls to places where there is no foreign consulate.

ARTICLE 12.

With a view to the maintenance of intercourse between the two countries, the two contracting parties pledge themselves to take the necessary joint action as promptly as possible for guarding and improving transport by sea and rail, the transmission of telegrams and so forth and for ensuring the free and easy passage between the two parties of persons and goods. The two parties will take concerted action to bring about the necessary arrangements with the Soviet Republics of Russia and the Caucasus. In any case, until a trade treaty or agreement has been concluded, the laws and regulations in vigour in each of the two countries will be scrupulously applied on the entry and exit of travellers or merchandise.

ARTICLE 13.

It is decided to begin as soon as possible the study of economic, financial and commercial agreements.

ARTICLE 14.

The two contracting parties agree to take the necessary measures to prevent any possible delay, regulations respecting the sanitary measures to be enforced in the ports of the Black Sea which form part of their territory.

ARTICLE 15.

The two contracting parties will set about establishing regular diplomatic relations immediately after the execution of this treaty. The two parties will then forward to each other a description with illustrations of their national flags and coats of arms.

ARTICLE 16.

This treaty will be subject to ratification. Ratifications shall be exchanged at Kiakof within three months from the date of signature, and the treaty will be put into force on the day of the exchange of ratifications. In confirmation of the accord reached with regard to the foregoing stipulations, the delegates of Turkey and Ukraina have signed and sealed this treaty in the presence of one another. This treaty was drawn up and signed in two copies in French at Angora on the 2nd day of January, 1922 (1338).

YUSUF KEMAL
KRUNZE

Note.—A photograph of the delegates is reproduced by the "Wakt," which gives the following names:—

Krunze (evidently a misprint for Frunze); Pushkin Sakalon (sic), Dr. Braun, Secretary-General and Counsellor at Kabul; Husein Bey, Secretary-General of Foreign Affairs; Munir Bey, Political Counsellor; Yusuf Kemal Bey; Yusuf Akchura Bey; Hilmi Bey, Secretary-General and Counsellor at Kabul.

Sir H. Graham to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received January 23.)

(No. 49.)

My Lord,

Rome, January 20, 1922.

AS I have already had the honour to report to your Lordship by telegram, the "Messaggero" of yesterday's date published a long article on the Near Eastern question, in which it is stated that the British Government have resumed the conversations initiated some time ago at Ineboli with Refat Pasha. The article alleges that conversations are taking place at Constantinople between the representative of the British Government and General Harrington. Further, that the British negotiators have precise instructions from the Foreign Office, and the tenor of these instructions is given. A summary of the article in question is enclosed herewith.

I should not have been inclined to pay much attention to this article beyond the instruction which I had given to Mr. McClure, of the Press Department, to see

Mr. [redacted] to endeavour to ascertain the source of this misleading information and to correct it. But I found the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs, M. [redacted] yesterday evening, considerably perturbed over it. The Marchese della Torretta said that he was being attacked on all sides on the ground that, while France had already concluded her agreement with the Turks, Great Britain was now negotiating a similar arrangement, and Italy would, as usual, come in too late and be placed in a disadvantageous position. His Excellency asked me whether I could not take some action to mitigate the disagreeable impression produced by the "Messaggero".

I answered him in a spirit of complete loyalty and co-operation with the Italian Government. There could be no truth in any report of separate negotiations between His Majesty's Government and that of Angora, and I was perfectly prepared to give a brief *dementi* to any allegations of such a character. His Excellency thanked me warmly and returned to the subject when I met him at a dinner at the American Embassy on the same evening. I have therefore issued this morning a brief *dementi* to the "Messaggero" article.

In the course of conversation yesterday the Marchese della Torretta told me of the conversations which he had had with your Lordship at Cannes on the subject of Turkey, and said that he would shortly furnish me with the official observations of the Italian Government on your memorandum, which he considered an excellent basis for the discussion of the whole question. He was in general agreement with your Lordship, but thought that we should have considerable difficulty in persuading the French Government to adopt a similar point of view.

I referred to the very interesting conversation reported by Sir H. Rumbold that he had had with Signor Tuozzi, but the Marchese della Torretta had not yet seen Signor Tuozzi who had only just arrived in Rome, and until he had seen him preferred not to

I have, &c.

R. GRAHAM

Enclosure to No. 12

Summary of Article in "Messaggero" of January 19, 1922

THE "Messaggero" of the 19th January published a long article on the Near Eastern question which expressed the usual doubts and fears regarding Italian interests. After referring to the Paris conversations between Lord Curzon and M. Poincaré, and the abandonment of the meeting of Foreign Ministers which was to have discussed the situation, the "Messaggero" points out the danger of Italian "exclusion," and proceeds to examine what it conceives to be the British programme. This programme was definitely injurious to Italian interests, and it was urgently necessary for Italy to resume direct negotiations with Angora.

The "Messaggero" continues—

French and British policy in regard to the Ottoman problem. We may indeed add that Lord Curzon has probably given an assurance to M. Poincaré that the British Government will not discuss the Ottoman problem in connection with French relations. We are brought to this conclusion by the fact that the British Government while it is discussing in Paris—is not losing time in Turkey.

In fact, notwithstanding previous *dementis* and those which may come in the future, the British Government has resumed the conversations which it had initiated some time ago at Ineboli with Refat Pasha, the Angora Minister of National Defence, through Colonel Grovel [sic] and Captain Benet [sic]. We base our statement upon private information which we have received from an unexceptionable source.

The actual conversations at Constantinople are taking place between Hamid Pasha, the British representative in Constantinople, the British representative in the Ottoman Empire and at the same time administrator of the Ottoman Bank and member of the Red Crescent and General Harrington, assisted by the colonel who initiated the conversations at Ineboli.

The instructions given by the Foreign Office to the British negotiators are particularly precise.

According to these instructions, England is disposed to withdraw opposition to the Franco-Rumelian Treaty, provided that certain modifications are made in regard to concessions in detail [sic].

According to the British plan for an agreement with the Kemalists, Greece would be obliged to abandon Asia Minor, and at Smyrna there would be established an international commission to safeguard minorities. The Euxine-Midas line would be recognised as the European frontier of Turkey. The international

The conditions attaching to these concessions would be: That Mustapha Kemal should come to an agreement with the Sultan, that the Turco-Persian and Turco-Afghan Treaties should not be directed against England, that Mustapha Kemal should recognise the Sultan as the legitimate ruler of Turkey, that England should receive concessions equal to those granted to France by the treaty of the 26th October.

Turkey would be allowed to maintain an army of 100,000 to 150,000 men until Bolshevik Russia should disarm. England would agree to the inclusion of Mosul within the Turkish frontiers.

The Armenian frontiers would be the subject of early discussion, but on the basis of those actually in existence.

E 1029 5 44

No. 13

Count de Saint-Aulaire to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received January 30.)

Ambassade de France, Londres.

le 27 janvier 1922

M. le Marquis,

AI l'honneur d'adresser, ci-joint, à votre Seigneurie un memorandum où sont exposées dans leurs grandes lignes des propositions qui, de l'avis du Gouvernement de la République, pourraient servir de base aux conversations qui doivent avoir lieu à Paris le 1^{er} février prochain, au sujet de la révision du Traité de Sèvres.

Ce memorandum a été rédigé, non pour répondre au memorandum britannique, mais pour exposer le point de vue français dont M. Poincaré a déjà entretenu votre Seigneurie. Comme le memorandum anglais tenait compte des dispositions des Grecs manifestées par M. Gounaris au cours des longs entretiens avec votre Seigneurie, le document français tient compte des dispositions des Turcs, que nous connaissons d'après les indications de notre Haut-Commissaire à Constantinople, de M. Franklin-Bouillon et de Ferid Bey, représentant officieux d'Angora à Paris.

Il est évident que l'opinion française n'accepterait qu'il soit pris de mesures coercitives contre les Turcs pour les obliger à accepter des conditions qui seraient arrêtées au profit du Gouvernement grec actuel et que le Gouvernement de la République ne pourrait, en aucune manière, participer à une action, de quelque nature qu'elle fût, tendant à leur imposer. Dans son entretien du 16 de ce mois avec votre Seigneurie, M. Poincaré a fait ressortir que le Gouvernement français ne saurait pas tant de discuter des intérêts respectifs des Alliés que de mettre d'accord les Turcs et les Grecs.

Or, au moment où a été préparé entre les Alliés le texte du Traité de Sèvres, la

situation respective de la Grèce et de la Turquie était toute différente de la situation présente.

La Grèce était dirigée par un Gouvernement qui, ayant décidé l'intervention de son pays dans la guerre aux côtés des Alliés, avait donné à l'Entente des preuves de son amitié et participait alors de l'autorité morale que donnait la victoire. Elle était unanimement soutenue par l'opinion qu'avaient émise les désordres de l'Administration turque et les crimes commis, notamment contre les Arméniens, avec la complicité des autorités allemandes. Matériellement, enfin, l'armée grecque, qui avait occupé sans difficulté la région de Smyrne, paraissait en mesure d'aider puissamment les Alliés à imposer à la Turquie des conditions de paix. La conception pouvait alors prévaloir de ne laisser subsister qu'une Turquie territorialement très diminuée, militairement déarmée, et, d'une manière générale, soumise à un contrôle international restreignant considérablement ses droits de souveraineté.

La situation actuelle est fort différente. La Grèce est maintenant gouvernée par le Souverain et les Ministres qui, pendant la guerre, se sont efforcés de la maintenir dans une neutralité dissimulant mal une secrète connivence avec les ennemis de l'Entente et qui demeurent responsables des attentats dirigés contre les armées alliées en Macédoine et contre les marines anglaise et française à Athènes mêmes. D'autre part, les abus et les violences commis par l'armée et les autorités helléniques en Asie Mineure, constatés par des commissions internationales d'enquête, ont encore réduit la part d'autorité morale que la Grèce tenait de sa situation d'alliée. Enfin, l'armée hellénique a été montrée incapable de remplir le rôle qui lui paraissait dévolu. Dans la lutte qu'elle a entreprise contre les forces nationalistes, elle a essuyé deux échecs et sa situation apparaît maintenant gravement compromise.

La Turquie, par contre, a fait preuve d'une vitalité et d'une force de résistance qu'on avait sous-estimées. Le Gouvernement d'Angora, qui paraissait, il y a deux ans, n'être qu'une organisation de fortune, d'existence très précaire, n'a cessé depuis lors de croître en cohésion et en puissance. Le sentiment national turc s'est prononcé en sa faveur et lui a donné tout son appui.

Ce sentiment national a été trouvé renforcé par le sentiment religieux de l'ensemble des musulmans, pour lesquels il est essentiel que le Khalife demeure à Constantinople, qu'il soit indépendant et suffisamment fort pour remplir son rôle de défenseur de l'Islam.

C'est dans la conscience même des peuples musulmans que les Alliés heurteraient directement s'ils ne tenaient pas compte de ces nécessités. Le Gouvernement britannique ne se dissimule certainement pas plus que le Gouvernement français la gravité des difficultés qui en résulteraient pour les deux pays qui ont le plus grand intérêt à maintenir le calme dans l'Orient.

Mustapha Kemal a su improviser une armée qui, malgré son infériorité en nombre et en matériel, a résisté victorieusement à l'armée hellénique. Cette infériorité en matériel et en effectifs est sur le point de disparaître et il y a tout lieu de penser qu'au printemps, les opérations militaires reprendront, le problème de la paix en Orient devenant insoluble pour les Alliés et créant une situation délicate dans leurs propres établissements d'outre-mer.

Le rétablissement de la paix est donc une nécessité urgente et un nouvel succès des efforts des Alliés pour y parvenir serait déplorable. Aussi, le Gouvernement français a-t-il tenu à examiner, dans l'esprit le plus objectif, la situation respective présente des Grecs et des Turcs. Il ne peut dissimuler qu'à son avis les modifications au Traité de Sévres, envisagées au mois de mars 1921, et communiquées aux parties en présence, ne sont plus suffisantes pour entraîner l'acceptation des Turcs qui peuvent faire valoir avec raison que, depuis cette date, les Grecs ont subi un échec militaire grave et ont — en repoussant en mars la proposition de commissions d'enquête, en refusant en juin l'intervention des Puissances — commis deux fautes politiques lourdes dont ils doivent supporter le poids.

Les conditions nouvelles de la paix ne paraissent par suite pouvoir comporter que des diminutions très restreintes du territoire proprement turc (le sort des territoires de l'Asie Mineure occidentale et un contrôle de l'Administration de la Turquie conciliable avec ses droits de souveraineté.

Veuillez agréer, etc.
SAINT-AU LAURE.

Enclosure in No

*Propositions en vue de la Réunion des Ministres des Affaires étrangères
relatives à la Révision du Traité de Sévres*

AINSI que le rappelle le memorandum britannique du 30 décembre 1921, trois tentatives infructueuses ont déjà été faites par les Alliés en août 1920, mars et juin 1921, pour arriver à la conclusion de la paix avec la Turquie. Les propositions faites à ces deux dernières dates ont été repoussées par le Gouvernement hellénique.

Pour assurer le succès, reconnu indispensable, d'une quatrième tentative il est nécessaire qu'un accord préalable entre les trois Gouvernements alliés s'établisse sur des conditions précises comportant une complète unité de vues des Alliés.

A cet effet, le Gouvernement britannique a, dans son memorandum du 30 décembre, exposé ses vues sur les principales questions en litige, à savoir : la répartition des territoires, la question de la Smyrne, la question d'une révision du Traité de Sévres. Le Gouvernement français a fait connaître ci-après son avis les différents points visés par le memorandum britannique.

Il est évident que, dans l'intérêt d'un règlement général, les vœux formulés par les Alliés sur la question de Smyrne doivent être réalisés dans toute la mesure du possible. L'existence de l'Administration grecque et surtout la présence des forces militaires grecques dans la zone de Smyrne sont des faits qui ne peuvent être ignorés.

Il est évident que cette zone ne peut être évacuée par les forces grecques sans que des mesures spéciales ne soient prises pour protéger la nombreuse population chrétienne qui l'habite.

Or, le retour de Smyrne, sous la souveraineté ottomane et entière, serait une condition sur laquelle les Turcs se montreraient irréductibles. Toute intervention

prévoit d'un démembrement.

Des mesures transitoires destinées à sauvegarder les personnes et les biens dans la zone de Smyrne doivent être prévues, pour être appliquées pendant un certain temps. Ces mesures doivent être immédiates et complètes. Des commissions mixtes, composées d'officiers et de fonctionnaires des Puissances alliées, avec une garde militaire, pourraient être installées dans les centres principaux, elles exerceraient une surveillance dont la nature serait déterminée selon les zones. Hors de la zone de Smyrne, soit sur la ligne Bosphore-Brousse-Eskişehir-Kütahya, Alioum Karahisar, les commissions pourraient séjourner trois mois. Dans la zone de Smyrne, elles resteraient un an. Aucun détachement d'infanterie ou de troupes turques ne occuperait le territoire avant l'arrivée des commissions internationales. Il semble, d'autre part, qu'il n'y ait rien de spécial pour les populations chrétiennes de la région de Smyrne et que les garnisons qu'elles devront recevoir ne puissent être autres que celles qui seront accordées aux minorités de tout l'Empire ottoman. Peut-être, en raison des très nombreux éléments étrangers qui habitent la population de Smyrne, pourrait-on envisager que cette ville fût dotée, comme Alexandrie, d'une administration municipale à laquelle partie seraient des éléments étrangers, est organisée municipallement, bien entendu, sous l'autorité du Gouvernement ottoman.

La Thracie occidentale a été réglée par le Traité de Neuilly. La Bulgarie, cédée aux principales Puissances alliées, la Thracie orientale a été rétrocédée par elles à la Grèce en vertu d'un traité séparé, signé en août 1913, et non encore ratifié. Elle est occupée depuis 1920 par les troupes grecques. Il ne peut être question de soulever cette question sans mettre en péril le règlement balkanique fixé par les Traités de Saint-Germain, de Neuilly et de Trianon, une fois qu'il n'y a pas lieu de revenir.

Thracie orientale

La population de la Thracie orientale, jusqu'à la Maritza, est en majorité turque, sauf la partie qui touche la Thracie occidentale et la presqu'île de Gallipoli. Le recours au plébiscite serait une source de difficultés dans un pays où les populations sont si

mêlées et où l'état civil est incertain. D'autre part, la nécessité d'assurer la sécurité stratégique de Constantinople rend désirable le rétablissement sur le sol européen d'une zone qui mette la capitale hors d'atteinte en cas d'attaque brusquée. La ligne partageant les territoires turcs et les territoires grecs pourrait donc suivre le cours de la Toudja jusqu'à Andrinople, puis la source de la Mariza jusqu'à Kouleli Bourgas puis de la rejoindre la mer de Mariza vers Rodosto. Le territoire rendu à la Turc serait immédiatement évacué par les Turcs et surveillé pendant six mois par une commission internationale comme la zone de Smyrne.

† *unpublished data*

Le Gouvernement français estime qu'il y a lieu de ne faire aucune réserve subordonnant le sort de Constantinople à l'exécution du Traité de Paix. Constantinople devant faire retour au Gouvernement ottoman sans aucune limitation de son :

Le déplacement vers l'intérieur de l'Anatolie de la capitale

leur des Puissances de voir la Turquie confirmer son attitude à leur politique générale de paix et d'ordre et voir un régime intérieur compatible avec l'existence sur son territoire de nombreuses populations chrétiennes. Les maintien jusqu'à la ratification de la paix des troupes alliées dans la ville même le font présente jour les Puissances aucun avantage.

1986 1987 1988 1989 1990 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2032 2033 2034 2035 2036 2037 2038 2039 2040 2041 2042 2043 2044 2045 2046 2047 2048 2049 2050 2051 2052 2053 2054 2055 2056 2057 2058 2059 2060 2061 2062 2063 2064 2065 2066 2067 2068 2069 2070 2071 2072 2073 2074 2075 2076 2077 2078 2079 2080 2081 2082 2083 2084 2085 2086 2087 2088 2089 2090 2091 2092 2093 2094 2095 2096 2097 2098 2099 2100 2101 2102 2103 2104 2105 2106 2107 2108 2109 2110 2111 2112 2113 2114 2115 2116 2117 2118 2119 2120 2121 2122 2123 2124 2125 2126 2127 2128 2129 2130 2131 2132 2133 2134 2135 2136 2137 2138 2139 2140 2141 2142 2143 2144 2145 2146 2147 2148 2149 2150 2151 2152 2153 2154 2155 2156 2157 2158 2159 2160 2161 2162 2163 2164 2165 2166 2167 2168 2169 2170 2171 2172 2173 2174 2175 2176 2177 2178 2179 2180 2181 2182 2183 2184 2185 2186 2187 2188 2189 2190 2191 2192 2193 2194 2195 2196 2197 2198 2199 2200 2201 2202 2203 2204 2205 2206 2207 2208 2209 2210 2211 2212 2213 2214 2215 2216 2217 2218 2219 2220 2221 2222 2223 2224 2225 2226 2227 2228 2229 2230 2231 2232 2233 2234 2235 2236 2237 2238 2239 2240 2241 2242 2243 2244 2245 2246 2247 2248 2249 2250 2251 2252 2253 2254 2255 2256 2257 2258 2259 2260 2261 2262 2263 2264 2265 2266 2267 2268 2269 2270 2271 2272 2273 2274 2275 2276 2277 2278 2279 2280 2281 2282 2283 2284 2285 2286 2287 2288 2289 2290 2291 2292 2293 2294 2295 2296 2297 2298 2299 2300 2301 2302 2303 2304 2305 2306 2307 2308 2309 2310 2311 2312 2313 2314 2315 2316 2317 2318 2319 2320 2321 2322 2323 2324 2325 2326 2327 2328 2329 2330 2331 2332 2333 2334 2335 2336 2337 2338 2339 2340 2341 2342 2343 2344 2345 2346 2347 2348 2349 2350 2351 2352 2353 2354 2355 2356 2357 2358 2359 2360 2361 2362 2363 2364 2365 2366 2367 2368 2369 2370 2371 2372 2373 2374 2375 2376 2377 2378 2379 2380 2381 2382 2383 2384 2385 2386 2387 2388 2389 2390 2391 2392 2393 2394 2395 2396 2397 2398 2399 2400 2401 2402 2403 2404 2405 2406 2407 2408 2409 2410 2411 2412 2413 2414 2415 2416 2417 2418 2419 2420 2421 2422 2423 2424 2425 2426 2427 2428 2429 2430 2431 2432 2433 2434 2435 2436 2437 2438 2439 2440 2441 2442 2443 2444 2445 2446 2447 2448 2449 2450 2451 2452 2453 2454 2455 2456 2457 2458 2459 2460 2461 2462 2463 2464 2465 2466 2467 2468 2469 2470 2471 2472 2473 2474 2475 2476 2477 2478 2479 2480 2481 2482 2483 2484 2485 2486 2487 2488 2489 2490 2491 2492 2493 2494 2495 2496 2497 2498 2499 2500 2501 2502 2503 2504 2505 2506 2507 2508 2509 2510 2511 2512 2513 2514 2515 2516 2517 2518 2519 2520 2521 2522 2523 2524 2525 2526 2527 2528 2529 2530 2531 2532 2533 2534 2535 2536 2537 2538 2539 2540 2541 2542 2543 2544 2545 2546 2547 2548 2549 2550 2551 2552 2553 2554 2555 2556 2557 2558 2559 2560 2561 2562 2563 2564 2565 2566 2567 2568 2569 2570 2571 2572 2573 2574 2575 2576 2577 2578 2579 2580 2581 2582 2583 2584 2585 2586 2587 2588 2589 2590 2591 2592 2593 2594 2595 2596 2597 2598 2599 2600 2601 2602 2603 2604 2605 2606 2607 2608 2609 2610 2611 2612 2613 2614 2615 2616 2617 2618 2619 2620 2621 2622 2623 2624 2625 2626 2627 2628 2629 2630 2631 2632 2633 2634 2635 2636 2637 2638 2639 2640 2641 2642 2643 2644 2645 2646 2647 2648 2649 2650 2651 2652 2653 2654 2655 2656 2657 2658 2659 2660 2661 2662 2663 2664 2665 2666 2667 2668 2669 2670 2671 2672 2673 2674 2675 2676 2677 2678 2679 2680 2681 2682 2683 2684 2685 2686 2687 2688 2689 2690 2691 2692 2693 2694 2695 2696 2697 2698 2699 2700 2701 2702 2703 2704 2705 2706 2707 2708 2709 2710 2711 2712 2713 2714 2715 2716 2717 2718 2719 2720 2721 2722 2723 2724 2725 2726 2727 2728 2729 2730 2731 2732 2733 2734 2735 2736 2737 2738 2739 2740 2741 2742 2743 2744 2745 2746 2747 2748 2749 2750 2751 2752 2753 2754 2755 2756 2757 2758 2759 2760 2761 2762 2763 2764 2765 2766 2767 2768 2769 2770 2771 2772 2773 2774 2775 2776 2777 2778 2779 2780 2781 2782 2783 2784 2785 2786 2787 2788 2789 2790 2791 2792 2793 2794 2795 2796 2797 2798 2799 2800 2801 2802 2803 2804

«signature de la paix, elles constitueraient une garantie suffisante pour la ratification...»

Zone de mûcheriages.—De trois à

La réduction de la zone à demilitariser proposée par le Gouvernement britannique, conformément aux vues échangées à Londres en mars 1921 et la diminution des garnisons allées à maintenir sur les rives nord et sud des Cardanellas appellent les observations suivantes. Il n'est pas à envisager que les Turcs acceptent une démilitarisation complète des Terrons, qui n'est d'ailleurs pas indispensable pour assurer la liberté du passage. La diminution des forces allées sur la rive nord-ouest ne serait incompatible avec la souveraineté ottomane que les Turcs veulent conserver intacte et

en qui concerne la Commission des Detraites, les modifications envisagées à Londres, en 1921 donneraient satisfaction à la Turquie.

L'intervention de la Société des Nations, tout pour assurer ultérieurement la délimitation de la zone des Détroits, pour exercer son autorité supérieure sur la Commission des Détroits, paraît répondre à la situation actuelle et à l'opinion de tous les pays ayant des intérêts maritimes en Orient. La position prise par les États-Unis

Grande-Bretagne ont proposé aux Etats-Unis en ce qui concerne les mandats

Il y aurait lieu de lever à l'indignation de la Turquie dans la Société la substitution d'une commission de la Société des Nations aux garnisons alliées des Détroits.

4. picture

Le Gouvernement français ne voit pas plus que le Gouvernement britannique la possibilité de reprendre la question de l'Arménie turque, mais il a examiné avec la plus soignée attention la proposition britannique tendant à la création en Cilicie d'une autonomie arménienne. Il ne doit pas dissimuler qu'à son avis cette proposition constitue une aggravation plutôt qu'une atténuation aux conditions de paix antérieures, toute délimitation géographique tracée sur le territoire de la Turquie apparaissant comme le prélude d'un nouveau démembrement.

Aucune analogie n'existe entre la situation de la Cilicie et celle du Liban avant la guerre. Au lieu de constituer, comme ce dernier pays, un royaume compact de 500.000 chrétiens, groupés dans une région montagneuse si pauvre que la Turquie avait renoncé à y lever des impôts, la Cilicie constituait, avec la région de Smyrne, la partie la plus riche du territoire ottoman. Les populations chrétiennes n'y constituaient après la

compte avec précision elle s'est élevée au total de 49.84 personnes, dont 40.000 Arméniens, auxquels on doit ajouter une centaine de familles qui ont pu échapper à

la statistique. Les autorités françaises ont dû constater que, malgré les garanties données aux populations et le man tien exempt de Yordra, 4,000 chrétiens seulement étaient demeurés en Cilicie. À supposer que tous les émigrés retournent en Cilicie, qu'il s'y joigne même un certain nombre de leurs compatriotes actuellement dispersés dans le monde, le nombre d'Arméniens qui se fixeraient dans cette région n'en demeurerait pas moins infime auprès de celui des Arméniens (y compris actuellement encore à 1,000,000) qui se trouvent sur les bords de la Turquie et de la Transcaucasie.

Dans cette dernière région existe un Etat arabe. Cet Etat est lui-même reconnu par les Persans, et son Gouvernement actuel ne l'est pas. Alors que son territoire constitue le berceau de leur race et comprend le siège du Catholicisme, et le suprême de leur religion et symbole de leur nationalité, on conçoit difficilement que les Arabiens, si dominés par la guerre puissent dispenser leurs efforts en une région qui est séparée de l'Etat arabe par toute l'Asie.

Le Gouvernement français, qui hâte à des résolutions arrêtées et publiées depuis longtemps, a déclaré qu'il n'y a pas lieu pour les Alliés

Le Comité propose le maintien, dans le 1^{er} alinéa, de la
du Traité de Sevres, l'insertion de la clause des
Europe plaçant leur pays dans la zone d'occupation
section d'une clause spéciale instituant au Haut-Commissaire
de la Société des Nations ayant les pouvoirs nécessaires pour assurer l'application des
en accordés aux minorités de Turquie

Le Gouvernement français, enfin, des né-
cessités d'inspire le Congrès.

de l'air, dans cette intention, les montres disposées à modifier

Le Gouvernement français recommande également pour la protection des intérêts de la Turquie l'adoption des dispositions inscrites dans les traités intervenus avec les puissances alliées, sous la garantie de la Société des Nations, sous la garantie de laquelle elles sont placées. La conclusion de la cinquième finale des traités européens pourrait être complétée et précisée : l'exécution des engagements serait placée sous la garantie et la surveillance de la Société des Nations. Cette surveillance ne pouvant prendre fin qu'après que la Turquie aurait été admise dans la Société des Nations, de même qu'il se traitait une commission d'experts de la Société des Nations pourrait être substituée aux garanties proposées à la garde des Détroits.

Au moment de la signature de la paix, l'envie de commissions de la Société des Nations dans d'autres pays signataires de traités de minorités serait particulièrement opportune.

Record transfer.

Le Gouvernement français est, comme en juin 1921, d'accord avec le Gouverne-

Il y a lieu de la maintenir sous la forme d'un engagement qui ne serait pas trop onéreux pour l'Etat. Mais, en attendant, il est préférable d'appliquer la loi sur les propositions d'achat.

Chamaea fasciculata

Ainsi que les deux Gouvernements l'ont reconnu aux mois de mars et de juin 1921 au sein même — dans des conditions maintenant invariables — les pouvoirs de la Commission financière, certaines des dispositions prévues par la Partie VIII du Traité de Sévres doivent être modifiées tant pour s'adapter à la situation actuelle que pour répondre à l'objet que se proposaient les Alliés. Si le maintien des engagements et des institutions antérieurs à la guerre ne peut faire l'objet d'aucune concession, par contre les pouvoirs d'une Commission financière à laquelle participerait la Turquie peuvent être considérablement réduits et leur durée limitée au temps où le

Turquie ne se montrerait pas en mesure de satisfaire aux obligations résultant pour elle du Traité de Paris.

D'autre part, l'importance et le caractère spécial pris par les dépenses militaires de la Grèce en Asie pendant les deux dernières années écoulées depuis le moment où a été préparé le Traité de Sévres obligent sans doute à réduire le montant du remboursement aux principales puissances de leurs frais d'occupation et à disjoindre les dépenses militaires de la Grèce. À défaut de ces modifications, il ne semble pas douteux que le rang assigné par le Traité de Sévres à la réparation des dommages de guerre subis par les ressortissants alliés ne laisse aucune chance à ces derniers d'être, au moins partiellement, indemnisés.

avec le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté pour compte des concessions proposées à la Conférence de Sévres devant faire l'objet d'un nouvel examen par les Alliés. La limitation des forces turques constitue une difficulté particulière au moment où tout l'effort de l'Asie s'applique à la nation qui trouve son moyen d'existence et, dans une certaine mesure, tiennent le mouvement nationaliste à leur merci. Il semble, cependant, que cette limitation pourrait être obtenue si elle était liée à celle des armements des pays voisins que la Turquie croit devoir la plus craindre, et par lesquels la Bulgarie a déjà dû souscrire à une pareille obligation.

Le maintien de la conscription répond au désir de la Turquie d'établir l'égalité de traitement entre tous ses sujets, conformément aux principes des États modernes. On doit, d'ailleurs, convenir que l'entretien d'une armée de volontaires constituerait une charge trop lourde pour les finances ottomanes et que, composée uniquement d'éléments musulmans, cette armée pourrait donner des sujets d'inquiétude à la population chrétienne de Turquie. Certaines garanties pour les non-musulmans incorporés dans les forces turques pourraient être obtenues dans l'organisation du recrutement et par la présence d'officiers étrangers. Quant à l'introduction de ces derniers dans les forces turques, le Gouvernement français estime que le Gouvernement ottoman doit pouvoir intervenir dans le choix de ces officiers et conserver sur eux une certaine influence.

Les diverses commissions militaires pourraient être maintenues si le Gouvernement ottoman y participait dans des conditions au moins égales à celles où il figure dans la Commission des Étrangers.

Autres questions

Ainsi que le fait observer le Gouvernement britannique, d'autres modifications seraient à apporter aux conditions antérieurement élaborées. Le Gouvernement français croit nécessaire de signaler, parmi elles, l'abrogation des capitulations, dont le principe devrait être plus expressément énoncé. On pourrait décider la création d'une grande commission qui étudierait l'ensemble des mesures à proposer pour amender le statut des étrangers en Turquie. Il y aurait lieu de renoncer à étendre les capitulations aux ressortissants d'États qui n'en bénéficiaient pas avant la guerre.

E 1122 5/44]

No 14

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Lord Hardinge (Paris).

(No. 314.)

My Lord,

Foreign Office, January 30, 1922.

ON Thursday last my Excellency the French Ambassador, in the course of a conversation with me on other points, indicated his intention to send to the Foreign Office a memorandum on the subject of the proposed conference on the affairs of the East, which I thought

accordingly not had the time or the opportunity to give to it the consideration which

impossible for me to proceed to Paris to-morrow, as hitherto arranged, in order

morning. There would have been no time to give more than a cursory examination

these proposals, and

such Ambassador, demonstrated that the French Government were apprehending the Paris discussion from a point of view so widely divergent from the British, and that they regarded the work which it is expected to accomplish in so different a light, that there could be small prospect of an agreement until these misapprehensions were removed.

with the statement that as the British Government had been at Paris and to Rome as a basis of discussion some weeks ago, the attitude as revealed by M. Gounaris in his long interviews takes account of the fact that the British Government were not

that His Majesty's Government have taken sides on behalf of Greece, the memorandum submitted by myself, or were about to take

must cause His Majesty's Government the greatest surprise, and

as much as

should be settled with due regard to Turkish sentiment

before that His Majesty's Government should

their. Their object is to see justice done to

in a great Mohammedan Power, equally in a great Christian Power, and equally must she remember that Greece was her ally, and also the ally of the French, in the latter stages of the war, and in that capacity rendered conspicuous services to the

But the French assumption meets with an even more conclusive negative in the history of the case. So far from the terms suggested by me as a basis of discussion at Paris being the result of my long interviews with M. Gounaris, or representing his ideas, they were never discussed with him at all during my conversations in London, my object being confined exclusively to obtaining the assent of the Greek Government to the

Britain, but of the Allied Powers as a whole. In so acting, I thought that I was acting in the name of Greece, or of the Allies as a whole.

It was a great surprise that I learned from his Excellency

Ambassador for that my memorandum containing as it did proposals, many of which must be intensely distasteful to the Greeks, and which, if accepted, would in some measure

impression that I was a political partisan, imposing upon them the obligation of stating

Mustapha Kemal.

But it may also be remarked in passing that the Greek Ministers have not conversed with myself or with the British Government alone. They did not come to London until they had visited Paris and had the privilege of more than one conversation with M. Briand, at that time Foreign Minister and President of the Council. They have also been to Rome and enjoyed similar opportunities there. Conversely, the French authorities, in spite of the advantages to which reference has already been made

note persons who are acquainted with Turkish opinion, the British High Commissioner at Constantinople having had frequent opportunities of conversing with representatives both of the Constantinople and the Angora Governments at the Sultan's capital. It would appear, therefore, that no one of the Great Powers has any claim to be regarded as the special spokesman of this or that combatant party. It has presumably been the desire of all the Allies to make themselves familiar with both sides of the case, with the object of arriving thereby at a just and equitable solution.

It must further be obvious that no discussion at Paris is likely to be fruitful. On the contrary, it will be condemned to certain failure if those who take part in it are

which the impending conversation was originally suggested by myself, and, as I thought, accepted both by France and Italy was that the three Powers should divest themselves of all prepossessions, and should approach this most difficult question from the widest standpoint and with the object not of gaining a victory either for Greeks or Turks, but of removing a dark cloud from the Eastern landscape and of re-establishing the peace of the world.

Bearing in mind this aim, it is difficult to understand what useful purpose can be served by presenting as is done in the French note, a historical narrative of recent events which will hardly stand the test of impartial examination.

The French Ambassador reminds us that Greece is still governed by the Sovereign, and the Government who were responsible for so unfriendly a policy in the early stages of the war. But he fails to remember that Great Britain has no more responsibility.

Severity about the present Government in this country is no more accountable to that monarch than

any, however, has wanted altogether to notice is that there was a period not far distant, when the Turks were a far more potent, bitter and formidable enemy to the

to be measured by years, exposing upon the Asia and upon Great Britain in particular an appalling sacrifice both of treasure and lives—a sacrifice which in the former respect has been continued for more than three years after the conclusion of the armistice, but is now apparently to be forgotten in the position of the revived fortunes of the Anglo-Greek Government and the ancient misdeeds of the Greeks.

In respect the French note appears again to err from the path of equity in its anxiety to throw discredit upon the Greek army and authorities for enquiry forgetting that in the published report of the progress of these dated the

conclusion was at last over the signatures of the French and Italian as well as of

a large number of atrocities in the land peninsula and it appears that those on the part of the Turks have been more considerable and ferocious than those on the part of the Greeks.

To distribute the responsibility for the terrible events that have occurred and are still occurring in Asia Minor between Turks and Greeks is not required at the present moment, but to ascribe them to one party alone is not only manifestly unfair but is

It may be said indeed that the paragraph in question in his Excellency's letter could only be a merely verbal transposition of names, having been made to apply with almost equal accuracy to the Turks as to the Greeks.

I have said enough to indicate that it is not on these lines that it will be of any use to enter upon the proposed conversations. Those who will be present are, it has hitherto been presumed, anxious not to discuss the rival merits, actions, or prepossessions of Turkey or Greece, but to find the conflict on terms which will be honourable to both. Such was the spirit in which my memorandum had been prepared, and such was the spirit in which I had hoped that it would be received.

French counter-propaganda which have been submitted with the Ambassador's letter upon

Their general character, however, is in harmony with the tone of the despatch itself, and confirms the impression produced by the latter. If they are to be regarded as a statement of the extreme Turkish claim, which they have every appearance of being, they indeed deserve full consideration from that point of view. But if they are to be regarded as the reasoned contribution of the French Government to the solution of the

forthcoming conference, I cannot conceal my apprehension that the conference may be of brief duration and that it will not be rich in results.

The fear of embarking upon a discussion on which the eyes of Europe will be fixed, but which might be attended with such a consequence is an additional reason why His Majesty's Government must be reluctant that their representatives should enter it with no doubtful prospect. It would seem to be an essential condition of

success that there should be a mutual recognition, in respect both of attitude and of terms, of the spirit in which the case should be approached.

There remains a further point of the highest importance which ought also to be any discussion can profitably begin, but which is left in doubt by the terms of the French despatch. It is stated in the third paragraph that neither the French Parliament nor French public opinion will allow of coercive measures being taken to enforce the terms adopted in favour of the Government will not in any way

the Turks

If the proposition here laid down be that it would be unfair to impose upon the Turks a solution of a markedly Greek complexion, there can be no objection to such a term than to the corresponding proposition that it would be unfair to impose a markedly Turkish solution upon the Greeks. His Majesty's Government can readily join the French Government in accepting either or both, but inasmuch as the object of the conference is not to devise either a pro-Turk or a pro-Greek solution, but to arrive at a decision which is fair to both the adverse passages will leave in obscurity the question what in the opinion of the French Government is to be done when such a decision has been reached by the three Allied Powers. Is it

it that it is to be enforced upon the Government will not in any way anticipate in such enforcement, but that, on the other hand, as the passage seems to imply, it may be enforced upon the Greeks should they refuse, and that the French will join in such enforcement? Or is the argument that the decision is not to be enforced on either party, and that the assumption of the conflict is to be witnessed by the Powers with helpless indifference?

In order to elucidate this very important question it seems desirable to examine with some precision the probable or possible course of the three Powers have come to an agreement contemplated by the French Government that when, either at Constantinople or elsewhere, those terms are expounded to the Greeks and the Turks, the former are to accept, on the strength of the attitude of M. Gounaris, while the Turks are to be at liberty to refuse. And if refusal be the course adopted by either party, is a different treatment to be meted out to both? Is the Greek to be coerced but the Turk to remain free? And, if so, what can be the defence of such a discrimination? Why should a different procedure be adopted with regard to the Turkish Peace Treaty than has been followed with regard to all the other Peace Treaties? In this case be it remembered, it is not with the Greeks that the treaty is being made. They are belligerents, but they are not enemies. On the contrary, they are at 11 and have been at 11. The Turks, on the other hand, have been and still are not merely belligerents, but enemies, inasmuch as they have not ratified the Peace Treaty. If they receive different treatment from the Greeks, it is not on the part of the Power with which

lessons than France. What then is the nature of the sanction that the Allies should now hold in view? Allowing that the exact nature of any such sanction is a legitimate subject of discussion, it is nevertheless clear that if the intended discussions at Paris are to be regarded solely as in the nature of friendly advice to be offered to the combatants, which either of them is to be at liberty to accept or refuse, or which the Greeks are expected to accept while the Turks will be at liberty to refuse, there is little to be gained from entering upon the discussions at all. For if either the Greeks or the Turks may reject the terms with impunity then the labours of the conference will have been thrown away, the meeting in which the terms are offered and refused will end in a humiliating failure and the responsibility for the growing misery will rest upon the Allies.

It seems therefore to be essential that some prior understanding on this subject should be reached before the conversations begin, and that we should not enter blindfolded on a path which may end in a precipice. From this point of view it is a matter for satisfaction that the issue has been so explicitly raised by the apparent reserve of the French despatch.

In conclusion, if the first impressions of the British Government have been stated in this communication with absolute frankness, this has arisen from no desire to create difficulties or to question the sincere and earnest desire of the French Government to arrive by methods of conciliation at the goal of peace, but only from the profound

conviction that there could be no greater disaster than the failure of the projected treaty. In this letter, such failure may not be remote.

I shall be glad if you will read this despatch to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and leave a copy of it in his hands.

I am, Sir,

CURZON OF KEDLESTON

E 1179 5 44

No 15

Notes of a Conversation with M. Franklin-Bouillon on January 27, 1922

TODAY I met M. Franklin-Bouillon at lunch at the invitation of Sir Howard J. Egville. Those present were M. Franklin-Bouillon, Sir Howard J. Egville, Mr. Headlam-Morley and myself. The lunch took place in a private room at Sir Howard's club. In this room M. Franklin-Bouillon talked at length upon the situation in the Mahommedan East, Bolshevism, the Treaty of Angora and our share in it, French policy in Asia Minor, the Turkish Nationalists and conditions in Asia Minor and Cilicia. It is only possible to give a brief summary of M. Franklin-Bouillon's long and often vehement discourse, given in fluent and almost perfect English.

M. Franklin-Bouillon began

by talking of the importance which had lived with the French people who had seen and conferred with them intimately, and—as he added—with the frank and over-present egotism which characterises him—the only European who had any business in the East. He had been to Angora four times. He had lived with the Nationalist leaders in Angora for fourteen months in all. He counted Mustafa Kemal Pasha and other Nationalist leaders as friends. He had known Asia Minor and the Middle East for twenty-five years. He had lived in and knew Russia well. He was therefore qualified beyond any other European to speak of the Nationalists, their aims, policy and circumstances. He was a politician; he was also an Eastern expert, and the only real Eastern expert in France. In addition, he was a strong supporter of the Entente. In his dealings with the Nationalists he had felt he was not working for France alone, but also for England.

He next touched upon Bolshevism and its prospects among Moslem peoples. He accepted Bolshevism as a rule of life. Moslems were the great enemy of Bolshevism in Asia. Nationalists had taken official notice of the Baku conference of 1920. At one of these conferences Z.

Bolshevik purpose of converting the Moslems to their religion. The Turkish delegation, M. Franklin-Bouillon said, was saying "This Bolshevism will not suit us, we must see the Bolsheviks as our enemy." Moslems now were as much opposed to Bolshevism as they had been.

At this point M. Franklin-Bouillon digressed to make a personal explanation of some interest. British attacks upon the Treaty of Angora had greatly disappointed and annoyed him. He had seen Lord Curzon of the "Daily Telegraph," who had proved unresponsive to arguments, and would listen to no explanation of French action in Asia Minor. Lord Curzon's attitude he had in fact, found despoiling. He had also seen Mr. Wickham Steed of the "Morning Post," and Mr. Curzon of the "Sunday Observer." They were the only ones who mattered. As the result of these interviews M. Franklin-Bouillon had changed his mind: he would write no letters or articles to the British press. He had also seen various British Members of Parliament and expected to see others. He did not actually say so, but he made it evident that he had hoped to see the Prime Minister as well though now he no longer entertained the hope. He said that he found everywhere a great change in English opinion towards France since the time of his previous visit. He must go back to Paris in time for the conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs on Wednesday next, he being the chief French expert on

These preliminaries out of the way, M. Franklin-Bouillon gave a consecutive account of how the Treaty of Angora came about.

He had gone to Constantinople, on the way to Angora, apparently on private business—but in Constantinople found the political situation created by the Nationalists so threatening to French—and British—interests that he returned to Paris immediately instead of continuing his journey to Angora. In Paris he saw the French Government and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and laid the situation, as he saw it, before them.

with his suggestions. The outcome was, apparently, the mission of M. Franklin-Bouillon to Angora for the purpose of negotiating the treaty.

For France, M. Franklin-Bouillon said, it was absolutely necessary that some arrangement equal to peace should be made with the Nationalists in regard to Cilicia. In Cilicia, France was expending 500,000,000 fr. a year; in Cilicia 5,000 French graves. France would not tolerate a continuance of this situation. These losses she had incurred in defence of the Armenians. She was the only Allied Power which had spent her substance and sacrificed the lives of her sons directly in the Armenian cause; she had done so for two years, as the 5,000 French tombs testified. She could make such sacrifices no longer. There was no need to defend this decision: it was monstrous, in view of these facts, to charge France with having abandoned the

Angora.

At this point he thought it well to refer, unprompted, to the secrecy with which the purpose of his mission was invested to the reticence with which M. Branda met Lord Curzon's enquiries on the subject. M. Franklin-Bouillon said that when he left Paris he had no knowledge that such reticence towards His Majesty's Government was contemplated. He understood that he was going to renew at Angora the negotiations which had resulted in the abortive agreement with the Nationalists in February of last year, negotiations of which His Majesty's Government had at the time been aware. He was astonished when he found later that one of His Majesty's Ministers had been to the present Angora Agreement was that it had been done.

It must be said, however, that on this point M. Franklin-Bouillon lacked the precision of its other parts. He was evidently skating over the top. He was deprecatory, sometimes vague. He referred to a conversation between the Prime Minister and M. Branda, in which the latter was said to have explained that a mission to Angora was contemplated, and to have understood that the Prime Minister offered no objection. Neither Mr. Headlam-Morley nor myself found M. Franklin-Bouillon's explanations as to French reticence clear. M. Franklin-Bouillon did, however, convey the definite impression that after he left Paris M. Branda had been subjected to some influence, Governmental or on the part of the Quai d'Orsay, which produced reticence towards His Majesty's Government in regard to the Angora Mission. He obviously

Continuing his narrative, M. Franklin-Bouillon said he went to Angora, "carrying only a stick and accompanied only by Serret" as interpreter, to see what he could do with the Nationalists. He found the general Nationalist conviction to be that the Western Powers had resolved upon the destruction of Turkish independence and the Moslem religion, and that for these purposes they were supporting Greece. Enghel was regarded as the arch conspirator in the scheme.

M. Franklin-Bouillon said he immediately combatted this idea, and by his offer to make, on behalf of France, an agreement with Turkey, was able to convince the Nationalist Government that the Western Powers had no such sinister purposes. He showed that France was anxious to obtain a peace favourable to the Nationalists, and that with France acting thus, the notion of the Western Powers being banded together to destroy Turkey must be given up. He claimed that in the long negotiations which followed he won the complete confidence of the Nationalists.

Referring now to the point made by His Majesty's Government that the treaty was except by common action, M. Franklin-Bouillon said that the words verbal of the negotiations showed that the principle of the undertaking had been observed. The present treaty was in no prejudice to matters which the Allies would have to settle together. He asserted with much emphasis that the treaty contained no secret clauses: "none whatever"; but his manner was unconvincing.

He added, that never before in the history of the Quai d'Orsay had it supplied to

foreign Power as now to Great Britain, copies of its secret papers showing the papers relating to the Ångora Treaty had been supplied to His Majesty's Government was a proof of French good faith.

The remainder of M. Franklin Bouillon's remarks were more discursive. He remarked that the struggle of the Turkish Nationalist Government excited the keenest interest in France. Lyastey had told him that in almost all parts of Morocco he was always being asked how Mustapha Kemal Pasha and the Turks were faring against the Greeks. In Azerbaijan, Daghestan, and among the Moslems of the Caucasus and in Transcaucasia, the same interest was shown. The Turkish Nationalist Government wielded more influence in Afghanistan than they did in some of the Anatolian vilayets. It was known well enough what their indirect influence was in Persia. Their influence could not be overlooked by France. The French Government would contain 30 per cent of the Turkish Nationalist Government in France. France could not afford to entertain Madam opinion as Great Britain had done. The Nationalists found that Greek uniforms, guns, ammunition, equipment, all had been supplied by England. The Greeks it was known were furnished with money by England. Challenged on this point, he replied that the money came from Zuharof and his group, and that they had made this money in England.

from the Nationalists, he replied that in that event the two would again become deadly enemies. "But Bâkirevîk support will not be withdrawn," he added. He entirely disapproved the story of Enver Pasha having been handed over to the Kemalists. As for Russia, she had no immediate future. He had lived in Russia and knew she was rotten. That could not be helped. The Powers, but not the Nationalists, were the only ones who could do that.

As for Russia, she had no immediate future. He had lived in Russia and knew she was rotten. That could not be helped. The Powers, but not the Nationalists, were the only ones who could do that.

As for Russia, she had no immediate future. He had lived in Russia and knew she was rotten. That could not be helped. The Powers, but not the Nationalists, were the only ones who could do that.

As for Russia, she had no immediate future. He had lived in Russia and knew she was rotten. That could not be helped. The Powers, but not the Nationalists, were the only ones who could do that.

As for Russia, she had no immediate future. He had lived in Russia and knew she was rotten. That could not be helped. The Powers, but not the Nationalists, were the only ones who could do that.

As for Russia, she had no immediate future. He had lived in Russia and knew she was rotten. That could not be helped. The Powers, but not the Nationalists, were the only ones who could do that.

As for Russia, she had no immediate future. He had lived in Russia and knew she was rotten. That could not be helped. The Powers, but not the Nationalists, were the only ones who could do that.

As for Russia, she had no immediate future. He had lived in Russia and knew she was rotten. That could not be helped. The Powers, but not the Nationalists, were the only ones who could do that.

As for Russia, she had no immediate future. He had lived in Russia and knew she was rotten. That could not be helped. The Powers, but not the Nationalists, were the only ones who could do that.

As for Russia, she had no immediate future. He had lived in Russia and knew she was rotten. That could not be helped. The Powers, but not the Nationalists, were the only ones who could do that.

As for Russia, she had no immediate future. He had lived in Russia and knew she was rotten. That could not be helped. The Powers, but not the Nationalists, were the only ones who could do that.

As for Russia, she had no immediate future. He had lived in Russia and knew she was rotten. That could not be helped. The Powers, but not the Nationalists, were the only ones who could do that.

As for Russia, she had no immediate future. He had lived in Russia and knew she was rotten. That could not be helped. The Powers, but not the Nationalists, were the only ones who could do that.

As for Russia, she had no immediate future. He had lived in Russia and knew she was rotten. That could not be helped. The Powers, but not the Nationalists, were the only ones who could do that.

request France had been unable to grant, regarding access to the Tigris as vital to her position in Syria. "But," said M. Franklin Bouillon, "I had seen the tomb of the great Turkish Sultan Ertogrul at Segud, near Eskişehir, defiled by the Greeks in the vilest manner, and I was able to use this fact to the advantage of France." "I said, 'You may not come down to the Euphrates at Meskene, but I will give you an enclave at Jaber Kalesi, where is the holy tomb of Suleiman Shah, which you call Turk Mezari. (Jaber Kalesi is on the Euphrates east of Aleppo.) It shall be under the Turkish flag for ever. I have seen the tomb of Ertogrul defiled by the Greeks. I grant you Turk Mezari in compensation.' This gesture, said M. Franklin Bouillon, secured the acceptance of the treaty by the Ångora Assembly.

He then spoke of Eastern Thrace. The Nationalists, he said, were absolutely resolved to recover possession of Adrianople, but Thrace was not on the same footing as the Balkans. As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

Asked what the attitude of the Nationalists was towards the League of Nations, he said it was less favourable now than previously, but there was respect for the idea, and the admission of Turkey to membership of the League would be received by the Nationalists.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

As for the Straits, the Nationalists had already admitted the principle that the Black Sea countries should have a voice in deciding the terms under which the freedom of the Straits should be secured. If the "freedom of the Straits" was to be guaranteed, the more Powers taking part in the guarantee the better. That was the Nationalist view. He did not regard the question of the Straits as one presenting grave difficulties.

W. J. CHILDS

Foreign Office, January 30, 1922

E 1093 312 44)

No. 10

Sir H. Humboldt to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received January 31.)

No. 70.

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 19, 1922

THERE have been persistent rumours in the last few days of a change of Government at Constantinople. These rumours are connected with the name of Mustafa Pasha, but may owe their origin partly to the fact that the Minister

[8975]

2

of Finance and one other Minister have not attended at their Departments for the last two days.

2. I happened to meet Chevki Bey, the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs last night, and alluded to the rumours in question of an impending change of Government. He said that he had also heard these reports, and had asked the Grand Vizier a few days ago what truth there was in them. Tewfik Pasha had informed him that he had mentioned to the Sultan the report that Mahmud Muhtar Pasha was likely to be entrusted with the formation of a Government. His Majesty had replied that there was nothing whatever in this report.

3. My Italian colleague called on me yesterday to mention these reports to me, and stated that it was asserted that "the English desired a change of Government." Was there any truth in this? I reminded him that I had several times told him that we did not mix ourselves up in the internal affairs of other Governments, and that there was not the slightest ground for the rumour that we were trying to effect a change of Government at Constantinople. I added, that it was a very foolish opinion, to be absurd to try and upset the peace of the country by spreading of these rumours to interested parties, such as members of the Opposition.

I have, &c

HORACE RUMBOLD, High Commissioner

E 1096 769 44)

No. 17

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received January 31

No. 71)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 19, 1922.

THE Minister for Foreign Affairs called on me on the 17th instant to speak again about the question of Thrace.

Izzet Pasha stated that he had been visited by a personage whom he was not at liberty to name, who had developed the following argument in favour of the restoration to Turkey of sovereignty over the northern shore of the Sea of Marmora. This personage had pointed out that, whereas the real strength of Turkey lay in Anatolia, she would always be weak in Europe. On the other hand, the Greeks were likely to remain strong in Europe. It was in everybody's interest that the northern shore of the straits should be in the hands of a weak rather than of a strong Power. Izzet Pasha considered this argument very forcible and wished to press it on our consideration.

2. He added that it was difficult to contemplate another war between Turkey and Greece. He pointed out that the British fleet to prevent communication between the Asiatic and European shores of the straits. Great Britain would not therefore run any risk if she restored to Turkey the territory in Thrace which would put the latter in possession of the northern shore of the Sea of Marmora.

4. I pointed out to Izzet Pasha that Turkey was not the only party to the present conflict. His Majesty's Government had to consider the claims of Greece. The Turks were asking that the Greeks should evacuate Anatolia and Eastern Thrace as well. Did he really imagine that the Greeks would tamely submit to giving up their present territory in Eastern Thrace? Izzet Pasha replied that it would be for their own good in the long run if they did so. I remarked that it was very easy for one person to state that a certain course of action would be good for another person, but it did not follow that that other person would take the same view.

5. I am forwarding a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister at Athens.

I have, &c

HORACE RUMBOLD, High Commissioner

E 1100 6 44)

No. 18

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received January 31,

No. 83)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 21, 1922.

ON the 18th instant I received a message from Hamid Bey, the Nationalist agent here, asking for an appointment. I accordingly fixed an appointment for the following day, when Hamid Bey came and remained with me for an hour and a half.

The conversation was long and somewhat rambling, but I have endeavoured to condense it in the present despatch.

2. Hamid Bey began by referring to a letter which he had sent me announcing the discovery and release by the Kemalist authorities of two more British Indians. These men have actually left Anatolia, and Hamid Bey drew attention to this as one proof of the manner in which the Ankara Government had respected their engagements. He said that I had been glad to receive the above information.

3. Hamid Bey then went on to refer to the reports which were in circulation for twenty-four hours here to the effect that Mastapha Kemal had been assassinated. I said that I had noticed these reports, but that I did not believe everything that was published in the press. He then alluded to the recent changes in the Ankara Government.

4. He then stated that one of the main objects of his visit to me was to see whether they were of no material significance was one of the main objects of his visit to me.

5. Hamid Bey pointed out that it was necessary for a correct appreciation of the situation to be formed from one's mind. Thus, in Europe, the responsibility of members of the Government was not clearly defined. This was not the case in Turkey.

6. He then stated that the Minister was doubly responsible for his actions—on the one hand to the public opinion, on the other hand to his colleagues. Therefore the resignation of the Minister would react on the Government as a whole. Nothing of the sort prevailed at Ankara. The theory of collective responsibility did not apply in the case of the Kemalist Government. There were no distinct political parties in the Grand National Assembly, whose 300 members formed a block, having the National Pact as the plank of their platform. The Kemalist Ministers were in reality heads of departments inspired by the same aim. They might resign on the grounds of ill-health or because they felt that they were not up to the work of their respective departments, but their resignation had no other significance. Reuf Bey, who was a personal friend of Hamid Bey, and who has recently resigned, was really ill and incapable of continuing in office. I said that I would take an early opportunity of suggesting that it should be communicated by him to the Ankara Government in view of the stories of their illness.

7. Hamid Bey then explained with interest, but am not by any means convinced that it is an accurate explanation and that all is well with the Ankara Government.

8. I then asked Hamid Bey whether he had seen the report made by the Swedish consul at Malta regarding the treatment of the Turks previously interned there. He replied in the negative. I informed him that the report showed how well the Turks had been treated. The Swedish Minister had communicated the report to Izzet Pasha, and I said that I would take an early opportunity of suggesting that it should be communicated by him to the Ankara Government in view of the stories of their illness.

Anatolia

9. I enquired what Hamid Bey thought of the prospects of peace. He replied that the Nationalists would be only too ready to make peace to-morrow on the basis of the National Pact.

10. I asked whether the Nationalists expected the Allies to accept all the conditions of the National Pact. Did they, for instance, really expect to recover Eastern Thrace? He said that they certainly had that expectation, for Adrianople was just as Turkish as Brusa and contained only some 3,000 or 4,000 Greeks. He added, however, that if it could be proved that the Greeks were in a majority in Eastern Thrace the Nationalists would be prepared to accept the situation.

11. I told Hamid Bey that I had recently heard from a good source that the Nationalists were determined to establish the capital of Turkey in Anatolia in order to escape from pressure at Constantinople. He vehemently repudiated this idea and referred to the mention of Constantinople in the National Pact as a proof that Constantinople must remain the seat of the Turkish Empire.

12. I said that it would appear from versions which had been published in the press of the treaty which the Nationalists had made with the Ukraine that they claimed that the States bordering on the Black Sea must regulate the question of the Straits. He replied that he was unaware of any such intention on the part of the Nationalists, and said that in any event there would be no question of erecting fortifications on the shores of the Straits.

13. As regards the Capitulations, Hamid Bey said that he could not see why Turkey could not receive the same treatment as Greece or Roumania. Turkish justice was just as good as Greek or Roumanian justice, although he admitted that it was not comparable to British justice. I replied that I did not think that the Allied

Powers would acquiesce in the proposal under which their nationals would be tried forthwith by Turkish courts. In this connection I alluded to the recently instituted provisional mixed tribunals at Constantinople.

12. We then discussed minorities. I said that I thought, having regard to the treatment to which minorities had been exposed in recent years in the Turkish dominions, the Allies would require real guarantees for their protection in the future. Hamid Bey replied that a treaty could stipulate for such guarantees on the same similar stipulations in treaties with Roumania and Poland, and that the world would abide by these stipulations. I pointed out that it was not possible to compare the treatment of minorities in Poland and Roumania with that meted out to them in Asia Minor. The Armenian massacres had profoundly stirred public opinion in Europe and America and had, to say the least, made the Western Powers sceptical with regard to the future prospects of such minorities as were left. I recapitulated the information which this High Commission had received from Colonel Rawlinson and others with regard to the deportations going on at the present day, and I enquired what confidence we could have in Kenalist assertions.

13. Hamid Bey repeated the arguments which I have heard so often from Turks in extenuation of their conduct towards minorities in the last few years. He said that up till thirty years ago the Christian minorities had lived on terms of friendship with the Turks. There had been no trouble. The Armenian massacres really owed their origin to the action of the Armenians at Van, where many Turks had been killed. This had aroused the Turks to a blind fury, and they had killed three or four times as many Armenians as the latter had killed Turks. As a member of the Red Crescent and a humane man he had deplored these massacres and had even wept on hearing of them. He denied, however, that the Armenian massacres and deportations had been anything like the scale commonly reported. It was quite untrue that nearly 1,000,000 Armenians had perished, because the Turkish Empire had not contained as many as 1,000,000 Armenians before the war. Perhaps 100,000 or 200,000 Armenians had perished in this manner. I replied that that was anyhow a terrible figure.

and Fawar Ibrahim had wished to destroy the Armenian race once and for all. On the contrary they had tried to avoid internal complications during the war, and had done their best to remain on good terms with the Christian minorities. I said that this was a new light to me. Referring to the recent exodus from Cilicia, he said that it was not in the interest of the Turks that Christian minorities should leave Anatolia. They were necessary to the Turks. I said that I had heard that the Turkish authorities in Cilicia were very much ashamed of the exodus from that province, the reasons for which were well known to them.

15. I told Hamid Bey that a perusal of the Angora press and reports which we had received from Angora showed that the Nationalists were imbued with real hostility to Great Britain. He affirmed categorically that this was not a fact. The Nationalists recognised Great Britain as the greatest Power in Europe, and it was not in their interest to quarrel with her. In the course of subsequent conversation, however, he practically admitted that the sentiments of the Nationalists towards us were anything but friendly, as they considered that we had been and were helping their enemies the Greeks. The French, he said, had shown their friendship by concluding the Franklin-Bouillon Agreement. The Italians had shown a proof of goodwill in securing Signor Tonini to Angora. Although the latter had not concluded any agreement, still his mission to Angora was a proof that the Italian Government took an interest in Nationalist Turkey. The British Government had stood aloof. I said that we were perfectly aware that the aim of the Angora Government had been to conclude separate agreements with the three Allies in the hope that the Greeks would be isolated. I took this opportunity of explaining the so-called Henry Mission in its true light. I pointed out that ex-Major Henry had had no authority to talk politics or to undertake any political mission. It was obvious to me that Hamid Bey was somewhat uncomfortable on hearing this. I added that, in spite of the attitude of the Angora Government there appeared to be a more friendly feeling towards Turkey in the English press. Hamid Bey replied that the Angora Government had noticed this and had recently telegraphed to him to enquire how much importance was to be attributed to the change of attitude in the "Times".

16. Summing up our conversation, I said to Hamid Bey that the Greco-Turkish conflict in Asia had reached an impasse. There was only one way out of this impasse, and that was that both sides should make sacrifices. Neither side could hope to get all it was out for. Hamid Bey replied that the Turks had already made

the utmost sacrifices possible. I pointed out that these so-called sacrifices were the result of the great war in which Turkey had been beaten. If the Turks stood out for the integral acceptance of the National Pact, I was afraid that he would find that it would be difficult to bring about peace. Were the Turks prepared to go on fighting until they had realised all the conditions of their National Pact, and could their army eject the Greeks from Asia Minor? Hamid Bey, who seemed somewhat depressed at the prospect of the resumption of hostilities, replied half-heartedly that he thought that a Nationalist army could drive the Greeks out of Asia Minor. I said that even hostilities were renewed in the spring and continued throughout the summer, the Near Eastern question would be no nearer solution. The only result would be that both bell gerrets would be completely ruined.

17. On rising to take his leave, Hamid Bey said that he was at my disposal whenever I wished to consult him. I impressed on him that throughout our session I had been expressing personal opinions. I was not impressed by Hamid Bey who strikes me as a person of mediocre intelligence.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner.

E 1101 5 44]

No. 19

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received January 31.)

(No. 23)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 23, 1922.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 66 of the 18th January, I have the honour to transmit herewith extracts in translation from the "Waki" newspaper of the 19th instant, reproducing views expressed by the "Hakimiyet-i Milliye" of Angora on the French Cabinet crisis.

3. The "Bosphore" newspaper of the 20th January appends to a not very accurate translation of a telegram sent from Angora on the French political situation and not expressed the view that the change of Government in Paris would only strengthen the bonds uniting France and Turkey. This telegram is stated to have been read amid acclamations in the Grand National Assembly.

3. The French authorities here have been at pains to give publicity to the same view, i.e., that the change of Government in Paris will in no way affect French policy in this country.

4. As I anticipated, the comments of the principal Greek newspapers are of no particular interest. The "Proodos" refers to M. Poincaré's hostility to King Constantine. The "Prota" observes at the end of its leading article that the composition of M. Poincaré's Ministry allows the Christians of the East to look upon it with more confidence than they have been feeling.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner.

Enclosure in No. 19

Extracts from the "Waki" of January 19, 1922.

L'AVENIR DES RELATIONS FRANCO-TURQUES.

"Hakimiyet-i Milliye," vu les vœux et les dispositions des membres faisant partie du nouveau Cabinet français, estime que les relations ne subissent pas de changement.

Angora, le 18 janvier. (De notre correspondant particulier.)

Le journal "Hakimiyet-i Milliye" a publié aujourd'hui un article de fond au sujet du nouveau Cabinet français constitué par M. Poincaré. Le journal précité, après avoir

donne des renseignements, par son article, au sujet de la carrière politique de M. Poincaré, nouveau Premier Ministre, ajoute :

"Il n'est pas possible de dire que M. Poincaré sera aussi conciliant que M. Briand, ex Président du Cabinet. En ce qui concerne les relations entre ce Cabinet et le Gouvernement de la grande Assemblée nationale de Turquie, il faut prendre en considération que M. Poincaré a personnellement reconnu la légitimité de notre cause nationale, et que pendant qu'il était président de la Commission des Affaires étrangères du Sénat il s'est efforcé d'apprendre, au sujet d'Angora, les choses qui ne lui étaient pas connues. Aina, il a invité M. ... la Commission des Affaires étrangères pour prendre des renseignements au sujet du Gouvernement d'Angora et la commission a écouté avec grande attention les explications fournies par M. Gauthier. Il en résulte que M. Poincaré a voulu de connaître et écouter nos revendications.

De l'autre côté, la présence au sein du nouveau Cabinet d'une personnalité comme M. Barthou, dont les sentiments à notre égard sont connus, et, de la plupart des Ministres de l'ancien Cabinet, peut être considérée comme une preuve que nos rapports ne subiront pas de changement." — *Le Figaro*.

Angora, le 16 janvier. (Agence d'Anatolie.)

Dans un article de fond que le journal "Hakimiyet-i Milliye" a consacré à la démission de M. Briand, le journal, après avoir relaté et résumé les événements qui ont précédé la démission, et les questions pendantes entre la France et l'Angleterre, déclare qu'il a été établi encore une fois que la politique accablante que l'Angleterre poursuit en Orient par l'entremise de la Grèce n'a pas été approuvée par l'opinion publique française, et il ajoute :

"M. Poincaré, dont on parle qu'il va succéder à M. Briand, étant une personne qui a écrit longuement de la nécessité de l'application intégrale du Traité de Versailles, la politique qu'il va suivre peut être considérée dès à présent comme celle qui est perdue d'affirmer qu'au cas même où M. Poincaré, qui voudrait avec l'Angleterre, il n'assurera pas cette alliance et cette amitié au détriment de la France.

"En pensant que la politique conciliante poursuivie par l'ex-Premier Ministre avec le Gouvernement de la grande Assemblée nationale de Turquie s'accorde avec l'opinion publique française, il faut noter et ajouter que M. Poincaré est un homme qui ne considère pas le Traité de Sèvres comme un traité applicable."

Le "Hakimiyet-i Milliye" termine son article en disant que M. Briand, alors qu'il défendait à la Chambre et au Sénat l'Accord d'Angora, a montré une droiture et une fermeté morales vues dans le temps sur l'horizon politique de l'Occident et a approuvé la sainteté et la subtilité de notre cause nationale.

E 1107 27 44

No 20

Sir H. Humboldt to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received January 31)

No. 95.

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 24, 1922

I HAVE had occasion in recent telegrams and despatches to advert to sundry political developments in Angora which have come to my notice since I wrote my despatch No. 1089 of the 29th November last. My information is necessarily somewhat meagre, but it seems worth while to present it, such as it is, in a connected form.

2. The debate in the Grand National Assembly at the end of November, on which I reported fully in my despatch No. 54 of the 16th instant, revealed the existence of a fairly strong opposition to Mustapha Kemal but it is still not clear whether this opposition represents merely an incoherent congeries of dissatisfied elements, or whether it is being systematically worked up by persons having a definite new policy in view.

3. In the course of the few weeks following this debate, several resignations were reported from Angora. Those of which I have definite knowledge are the resignations of the Vice President of the Grand National Assembly, the Governor-General of Angora

Bey, Commissioner for Public Works; and Jehal Bey, Commissioner for Economic Affairs. The resignations of the three Ministers have attracted great attention here. Kemalist sympathisers are at pains to represent all three as being simply due to reasons of health, but this explanation is not very convincing in the case of Refet Pasha, and still less so in the case of Raouf Bey. There can be little doubt that Raouf has definitely broken with Mustapha Kemal Pasha, a fact all the more significant as he was Mustapha Kemal's principal collaborator in the early stages of the national movement.

4. On the 19th January, a few days after the announcement of the Ministers' resignations, there was a glorification of Raouf Bey in the form of an interview given by him to the editor of the "Waki," Ahmed Emin Bey, who was, like Raouf himself, a Malta deportee, and who is now in Anatolia. The interview was given while Raouf was still a Minister, but it is significant that the "Waki" should have given it such prominence very shortly after his resignation. In the heading of the article prominence was given to Raouf's determination to go on fighting until the Khilafate and Sultanate should be rehabilitated in conditions of complete independence for Turkey.

Finally, recent advices from Angora show that the question of the law on the press and responsibilities of Ministers has been again brought to the front instead of being shelved, as might have been expected. The Angora press announces that the joint committee charged with the elaboration of a new draft law appointed a sub-committee of five to study the question. The names of the five members of the committee have not yet been published. The best known among them appear to be persons of moderate views.

6. I find it difficult with my present information to put a confident interpretation on these developments. I can only formulate with great reserve a theory which must be tested by further developments, but which may be useful in attempting to approximate the truth.

It looks to me as though Mustapha Kemal and those who still support him loyally may be swung back towards the Bolsheviks. There are several signs of a détente between them and the Bolsheviks.

in November. Little is now heard of open Bolshevik support of Enver Pasha or his party. A new Bolshevik envoy has just arrived in Angora. The negotiations for the Angora-Ukraine Treaty were rushed through with great celerity at the end of December. Mustapha Kemal's recent public utterances have been characterised by cordiality towards Soviet Russia. In a speech delivered on the occasion of the conclusion of the Ukrainian Agreement, he said that it had been thought that there were misunderstandings between Turkey and Russia, and he categorically denied the existence of such misunderstandings. At another public event he abounded in praise of the Russian system in Turkey was identical with the Soviet system.

7. It is not to be denied that there is a sincere desire for the independence and prosperity of the Turkish people. Again, in his speech of welcome to the Soviet-Bukhara Commission (see my despatch No. 1089 of the 29th November last), he declared that he regarded the Russian people as men who had recognised, not merely in theory but in fact, the right of peoples to dispose of their own destinies.

8. Without attaching undue importance to such utterances of occasion I think that these utterances support the view that Mustapha Kemal is leaning once more on the Bolsheviks to a greater extent than he was disposed to do three months ago. This may be attributed to his internal difficulties, to his fear of being supplanted by Enver working under Bolshevik auspices, and to a realization of the fact that, in view of the failure of the Tuoxi negotiations and the intransigence of the British Government, he is further than he supposed from securing the acceptance of the national pact by the Allies.

9. On the other hand, the two most definite elements in the opposition to Mustapha Kemal appear to be Enver and some others of the old guard of the Committee of Union and Progress, and a party who hanker after better relations with the Turkish Throne. These elements are not necessarily entirely distinct, as it would suit the Enverist opponents of Mustapha Kemal to play off the Khilafate against him. There is a group of Turks at Berlin among whom, I am told, Rahim Bey, formerly Vali of Smyrna, now plays the leading part. Rahim Bey is one of the strong Salonika element.

10. It is not to be denied that there is a sincere desire for the independence and prosperity of the Turkish people. Again, in his speech of welcome to the Soviet-Bukhara Commission (see my despatch No. 1089 of the 29th November last), he declared that he regarded the Russian people as men who had recognised, not merely in theory but in fact, the right of peoples to dispose of their own destinies.

10. As a postscript to the interesting note that the Minister must have talked about in connection with the latest rumour of a Cabinet crisis here appears to be Fak Nuhbet Bey, Minister of Finance. This gentleman is also a Salonica Jew, closely connected with Djavid Bey. He is said to manifest resentment at the extreme subservience of the Constantinople Government to Ankara.

11. Briefly, the theory which I advance very tentatively is that Mustafa Kemal is desirous to renege with the Bolsheviks; that the Bolsheviks are less disposed than they were to run Enver in opposition to him; and that the most coherent element in the opposition to Mustafa Kemal is a group of stalwarts of the old Committee of Union and Progress.

theory at all, it is doubtful whether the active spirits in such a movement would be more conspiratorial than their dispositions towards the Allies and more sincerely loyal to the Sultan than Mustafa Kemal himself, but if they should succeed in undermining Mustafa Kemal's position without themselves acquiring too much power, their activities might have the result of reuniting the Sultan in a position of greater authority, a consummation which would be to the advantage of Turkey, and should, from an Allied point of view, tend to bring about a peaceful settlement in the East.

As against the theory of a real rapprochement between the Ankara Government and Moscow, it is only fair to say that there is still much talk of Russian and Turkish concentrations of troops in the neighbourhood of the Turco-Caucasian frontier. Such a concentration of mutual suspicion, but they do not necessarily mean a rupture. Especially as Kazim Karabekir, the Nationalist commander in North-eastern Anatolia, does not necessarily share all Mustafa Kemal's views, and is somewhat independent in military arrangements.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD

High Commissioner

E 1071 5 44)

No 21

Sir R. Graham to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston — (Received January 31)

No 84. (Confidential)

My Lord,

Rome, January 27, 1922.

With reference to your Lordship's despatch No. 1043 of the 28th ultimo and to my telegram No. 28 of to-day's date, I have the honour to transmit herewith a translation of a note *verbale* from the Italian Ministry for Foreign Affairs respecting the revision of the Treaty of Sevres, which has excellency handed to me to-day.

As there was barely time to have it translated and copied for this evening's bag, I did not discuss it with his Excellency, but he made it sufficiently clear that Italian support of your Lordship's proposals was dependent upon your accepting the proposals, mainly of an economic nature, now put forward by the Italian Government.

I have, &c.

R. GRAHAM

Enclosure in No. 21

Memorandum from Italian Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

(Confidential)

THE Italian Government thanks the British Government for having communicated to it the secret memorandum regarding the proposals for discussion at the forthcoming conference of the Allied Foreign Ministers.

The Italian Government has examined the document in question concerning the modifications of the Treaty of Sevres which the British Government proposes as a basis for discussion between the Allies, in order to render that treaty acceptable to both Turks and Greeks, and it is now able to formulate its observations and proposals regarding the various points of the memorandum.

Nevertheless, before setting them forth, the Italian Government, accepting the invitation contained in point 20 of the British memorandum, wishes to submit a

question which it considers of fundamental importance for its interests as a whole Mediterranean Power, and which is, in its opinion, of great influence on its whole attitude towards the forthcoming discussions at Paris.

(A.) The Italian Government is aware that the Tripartite Agreement has been erroneously interpreted in Turkey as containing the bases for a claim to the future partition of Asia Minor.

Although the fact that the Tripartite Agreement was communicated to Turkey did not imply any recognition by Turkey of the provisions of the Agreement as a pretext for opposition by certain Ottoman parties, since it is certain that, otherwise, such an attitude could not have been adopted towards a convention which was *res inter alios acta*.

The Italian Government, after a careful examination of the question, has come to the following conclusions:

1. The Tripartite Agreement has a double significance and a double value for Italy. As regards the Allies, it has the significance and the value of recognising the primary interest of Italy in a zone with a Mediterranean littoral, which constitutes, moreover, a factor for economic and political equilibrium in that sea. As regards Turkey, it should not be considered as a political value or significance, but it represents means offered to Italy — economic activity — in preference to French and English economic activity — of peacefully collaborating with the Turks in the reciprocal interests of developing commerce and utilising a region whose prosperity is not only useful, but even necessary, for the improvement of the economic life of the two countries.
2. In these circumstances, the Allies have reaffirmed, as is natural, their intentions steadily to maintain between themselves their undertakings under the Tripartite Agreement (i.e., not only not to interfere with each other's activities in their respective zones, but to support them mutually and to prevent any eventual opposition on the part of the Ottoman Government to the question of an explicit acceptance by the Ottoman Government of the provisions of the Tripartite Agreement, which would have a great importance, provided that some other way of putting the agreement into practical effect be found).
3. It is, indeed, essential for Italy to achieve this, both from the economic point of view and from that of her prestige and position in the Mediterranean, where the mandates given to France and England have seriously affected, to the prejudice of Italy, an equilibrium of power which was already compromised so far as she was concerned. The Italian Government could not therefore ever agree to the creation of a state of affairs which would practically exclude the establishment of Italian activity in the Eastern Mediterranean.
4. While gratefully taking act of the British Government's declaration that it is fully disposed to execute its undertakings under the Tripartite Agreement and to examine, in concert with Italy, the best means of giving effect to them, the Italian Government is of opinion that those means are already laid down in the provisions of the Treaty of Sevres relative to the financial commission, and that, without going so far as to notify Turkey the Tripartite Agreement or to impose it on her in any shape, a possible safeguard is thereby afforded to Italian interests.
5. By a certain modification of the clauses respecting the organisation of the financial commission to render them more acceptable to Turkey, and by maintaining certain provisions of the Treaty of Sevres (as set forth below), it will be possible to succeed in applying indirectly the Tripartite Agreement without making the least allusion to it in the new negotiations for peace with Turkey, who will have no further pretext for any sort of opposition to the acceptance and establishment of a definite peace.
6. The Italian Government, while limiting its demands to the above, feels bound to declare that it counts on the full, loyal and entire support of its Allies in order that during the negotiations with Turkey the new peace conditions offered to Turkey may be considered and imposed on her as a single whole in such a way as to make it impossible for her to accept the very important concessions made to her in the greater part of the questions at issue, while rejecting only some clauses of the original Treaty of Sevres which are not new, but are already included in

that treaty. If the diplomatic action of the Allies is joint and unanimous in the sense desired, there is every possibility that it will not be difficult to obtain the consent of Turkey. But if, through excessive intransigence on the part of Turkey or for lack of cohesion and efficacy in the diplomatic action of the Allies, the already restricted guarantees which Italy demands should be further diminished, the Italian Government would find itself compelled to display a less conciliatory attitude towards the other clauses of the Peace Treaty and towards the questions concerning the separation of the Arab countries from the Ottoman Empire.

(11.) The Italian Government proposes, with reference to the above, the following modifications in the financial clauses in the Treaty of Sévres:—

La Commission financière aura pour mission

- (a.) D'arrêter les comptes des dépenses des forces alliées d'occupation du 30 octobre 1918 dans les territoires restant ottomans et les forces alliées d'occupation dans les territoires détachés de la Turquie au profit des Puissances autres que celle qui a supporté ces dépenses.
- (b.) De fixer les annuités par lesquelles ces dépenses seront payées, en tenant compte de la situation financière de la Turquie, de la nécessité de pourvoir aux dépenses essentielles de son administration et de permettre à la Turquie de combler toute insuffisance éventuelle dans la somme requise pour le paiement de la portion des intérêts de la Dette publique ottomane, restant à la charge de la Turquie, conformément à la présente partie.
- (c.) D'arrêter l'annuité à affecter au règlement des réclamations relatives tant aux personnes qu'aux biens dont il est question à l'article 232 ou les sommes à la disposition des Puissances alliées conformément à l'article 237 servant insuffisantes à assurer cette charge.

La Commission financière fixera la monnaie dans laquelle ces annuités devront être

Le montant de ces annuités pourra être modifié chaque période quinquennale suivant la situation financière de la Turquie.

Le Gouvernement ottoman affecte d'ores et déjà et irrévocablement au paiement des annuités, à déterminer au vertu de l'article précédent paragraphes (b) et (c), et des dépenses normales des forces alliées d'occupation qui pourront être maintenues dans le territoire restant ottoman

- (a.) Les revenus des douanes du territoire restant ottoman.
- (b.) Les revenus de services d'intérêt public, de concessions minières, agricoles d'autres concessions existantes et à être octroyées dans l'avenir sur le territoire restant ottoman.

La Commission financière prendra toutes les mesures qu'elle jugera nécessaires pour contrôler les revenus susdits et en augmentera le rendement, et pour en assurer la perception.

La Commission financière assurera aussi la perception des revenus affectés au service de la Dette ottomane annexée, et dont la gestion était faite jusqu'ici par le Gouvernement ottoman.

ARTICLE 232 ter

La Commission financière prendra, d'accord avec le Gouvernement, toutes les mesures qu'elle jugera convenables pour maintenir et accroître les ressources de la Turquie.

Le budget à présenter annuellement au Parlement par le Ministère des Finances doit être soumis, en premier lieu, à la Commission financière, qui veillera au respect des garanties affectées au service de la Dette publique (voir Annexe No. 1) et au service des dépenses des armées d'occupation des annuités mentionnées à l'article 232, et fera, en outre, toutes les observations et suggestions qu'elle jugera opportunes pour l'équilibre budgétaire et la bonne gestion des finances de l'Empire, et qui devront être communiquées au Parlement.

La Commission financière surveillera l'exécution des budgets, lois et règlements financiers de la Turquie. Cette surveillance sera exercée par l'Inspection ottomane des Finances, qui sera sous les ordres directs de la Commission financière, et dont les membres ne seront nommés qu'avec l'approbation préalable de cette commission.

Le Gouvernement ottoman s'engage à fournir à ces inspecteurs toutes les facilités nécessaires à l'accomplissement de leur tâche et à prendre vis-à-vis des fonctionnaires insuffisants des services financiers du Gouvernement toutes mesures que la Commission financière pourra suggérer.

ARTICLE 233

La Commission financière sera en outre chargée, d'accord avec le Gouvernement ottoman, le Conseil de la Dette et la Banque impériale ottomane

ARTICLE 234 (à supprimer).

ARTICLE 235 (inchangé)

ARTICLE 236

Exception faite des revenus concédés ou donnés en garantie du service de la Dette publique ottomane et de ceux affectés au service des dépenses et annuités 2 et 232 bis, toutes les ressources de la Turquie seront à la disposition du Gouvernement ottoman.

Les revenus affectés à la garantie des dépenses d'occupation et des annuités 1 et 232 bis serviront en tant que de besoin de la manière suivante:

1. En premier rang, après le paiement des traitements et des dépenses courantes de la Commission financière, ainsi que les dépenses normales des forces alliées d'occupation qui pourront être maintenues après la mise en vigueur du présent traité dans les territoires restant ottomans, viendront les dépenses des forces alliées d'occupation depuis le 30 octobre 1918 dans les territoires restant ottomans et les dépenses des forces alliées d'occupation dans les territoires détachés de la Turquie au profit d'une Puissance autre que celle qui a supporté ces dépenses d'occupation.
2. En second rang, viendra l'indemnité que le Gouvernement ottoman devra payer, conformément à l'article 236, à raison des réclamations des Puissances alliées pour les pertes ou dommages subis par leurs ressortissants, non compris ceux mentionnés à l'article 317, Partie IX (Chapitre économique), soit dans leurs personnes, soit dans leurs biens, par suite de tout acte ou négligence des autorités ottomanes pendant la guerre.

La Commission financière fixera le montant et pourvoira au paiement de toutes les réclamations pour dommage personnel. Les réclamations relatives aux biens seront examinées, fixées et payées conformément à l'article 287, Partie IX (Chapitre économique).

ARTICLES 237 et 238 (inchangés)

ARTICLE 239

Aucune concession nouvelle ne devra être accordée par le Gouvernement ottoman ni aucune concession devra être prorogée, soit en faveur de ressortissants ottomans, soit en faveur de toute autre, sans le consentement de la Commission financière.

La Commission financière aura la faculté de nommer son propre délégué auprès des Départements compétents pour surveiller à ce que les droits qui lui sont assurés en matière de concessions par le présent traité soient respectés. Le Gouvernement ottoman fournira à ce délégué tous les pouvoirs nécessaires pour l'accomplissement de sa mission.

L'Administration des Domaines sera placée sous les ordres d'un directeur général nommé et révoqué par la Commission financière et responsable vis-à-vis de celle-ci. Le tarif des droits des douanes ne pourra être modifié qu'avec l'approbation de la Commission financière.

ARTICLES 240-245 (inchangés)

La 6^{me} partie est à supprimer.
Le 7^{me} paragraphe est à modifier comme suit :

"Les Gouvernements de France, de Grande-Bretagne et d'Italie déclarent à la majorité et après avoir consulté les porteurs, s'il y a lieu de maintenir le conseil ou de le remplacer par la Commission financière. La décision des Gouvernements devra intervenir dans les six mois après l'entrée en vigueur du présent traité."

ARTICLE 258 (à supprimer).

ARTICLE 259

ottoman, telles qu'elles résultent de la présente partie, auront reçu satisfaction et que la Dette publique ottomane d'avant-guerre aura été liquidée, la Commission financière cessera ses fonctions.

Cependant, après une période de vingt-cinq années à partir de la date de l'entrée en vigueur du présent traité, le Gouvernement ottoman pourra examiner, avec le Conseil de la Société des Nations, si les Puissances alliées doivent continuer au Gouvernement ottoman l'assistance de la Commission financière et dans l'affirmative, la forme que pourra prendre la continuation de cette assistance.

ARTICLE 258 (à supprimer).

ARTICLES 259 et 260 (échanges).

E 1221 900 44)

No. 22

Lord Hardinge to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received February 3.)

(No. 306.)

HIS Majesty's Ambassador at Paris presents his compliments to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and has the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a note to M. Poincaré, dated the 2nd February, respecting the

February 2, 1922

Enclosure in N

Lord Hardinge to M. Poincaré

M. le Président du Conseil,

Paris, February 2, 1922

YOUR Excellency is doubtless aware that both the British and the Italian representatives at Constantinople abstained from attending the requiem service for the

out to your Excellency

this requiem, which was recorded in the *procès verbal* and cannot be regarded as other than unhelpful, seems to have been entirely ignored by the French Government in the present instance.

It is, in the view of His Majesty's Government, most desirable that there should be no further regrettable incident either at the Te Deum which will be held at Constantinople on the election of the new Pope or on any other occasion. I have therefore the honour, under instructions from the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to express the hope that the French Government will without further delay inform the Vatican of their renunciation and will send the necessary instructions to their representatives in the East (particularly their High Commissioner at Constantinople) to conform to the present situation.

I have, &c

HARDINGE OF PENSHURST

E 1252 5 44)

No. 23

Lord Hardinge to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received February 4.)

(No. 306.)

My Lord,

Paris, February 3, 1922

I HAVE the honour to transmit to you herewith M. Poincaré's reply to your Lordship's despatch No. 314 of the 30th January, in regard to the negotiations on the Eastern question, with the receipt of which I acquainted your Lordship in my telegram No. 59 of to-day's date.

I am sending the enclosures to M. Poincaré's note in original and should be grateful if I might be supplied in due course with the printed copies thereof.

I have, &c

HARDINGE OF PENSHURST

Enclosure 1 in No. 3

M. Poincaré to Lord Hardinge

Ministère des Affaires étrangères,

Paris, le 2 février 1922

Mon cher Ambassadeur,

J'AI relu avec attention la lettre que Lord Curzon vous a adressée le 30 janvier et dont vous m'avez laissé hier le texte. Je ne crois pas inutile de vous exposer les considérations qu'elle m'inspire. Je pense, comme Lord Curzon, qu'il y a de réels avantages à surseoir, jusqu'au 9 février, à la réunion convoquée des trois Ministres des Affaires étrangères. Ce délai permettra de continuer de causer par la voie diplomatique et d'éviter tout malentendu lorsqu'on se réunira à Paris.

Lord Curzon remarque que le memorandum anglais et le memorandum français ont été rédigés en se plaçant à des points de vue tout à fait différents. Je suis très heureux de prendre acte de l'assurance qu'il donne qu'il n'a pas été influencé, en faisant ses propositions, par les conversations qu'il a eues à Londres avec les Ministres grecs, conversations dont il a, à plusieurs reprises, entretenu mon prédécesseur. Je n'ai pas moins de la hauteur de vues et d'esprit du Principal Secrétaire d'Etat, je suis sûr qu'il a recherché seulement les moyens d'arriver à rétablir en Orient la paix que tout le monde désire. Je lui demanderai d'être également persuadé que j'ai moi-même été guidé par ce sentiment. N'ayant pas de rapports officiels avec les Turcs d'Angora, je n'ai d'ailleurs pas pu comme lui même l'a fait pour les Grecs, obtenir d'eux par une conversation directe, qu'ils se placent entre les mains des Alliés. Aussi bien je voudrais qu'on ne se méprenne pas sur le caractère du

document que M. Poincaré vous envoie.

Je suis tout à fait d'accord avec Lord Curzon pour penser que les trois documents doivent faire abstraction de toute idée préconçue et de tout intérêt. Il s'agit d'abord cette difficile question du point de vue le plus large et avec la

horizon oriental les nuages noirs et de rétablir la paix du monde.

Le memorandum français, pas plus que le memorandum anglais ne saurait être, à lui seul, une base de discussion. Le second n'est en tout cas pas une réponse au premier. Je considère ces deux documents comme de simples exposés des conditions qui paraissent des deux côtés requises pour arriver au rétablissement de la paix, de même que le memorandum italien sera un exposé des vues italiennes. Dans l'entretien

suggéré à ce moment que le Gouvernement français profitant de ses bonnes relations avec le Gouvernement d'Angora pourrait informer, au moins officiellement, des vues de ce dernier. Cette suggestion n'ayant pas été agréée par Lord Curzon je n'ai pas insisté.

Nous n'avons pas été préoccupés, en rédigeant notre memorandum, de défendre des intérêts français contre d'autres intérêts concurrents. Nous nous sommes bornés, je voudrais que Lord Curzon en fût persuadé, à rechercher objectivement des bases pratiques pour le rétablissement de la paix entre les Grecs et les Turcs et il ne serait pas exact de prétendre que nous ne retenions dans notre memorandum aucune des

2. L'armée hellénique de Smyrne compte 11 divisions d'infanterie (180.000

hommes)

Elle représente l'effort maximum de la Grèce, et son entretien prolongé risque d'entraîner pour cette Puissance des sacrifices financiers incompatibles avec ses moyens et une tension politique et morale, dangereuse pour la situation intérieure du pays. Déjà l'armée hellénique a montré des symptômes graves de fatigue et d'indiscipline, ses échecs successifs semblent avoir épuisé sa capacité offensive. La présence d'une armée nationaliste exaltée par le succès de sa résistance, elle paraît d'ailleurs pour le moment vouloir se borner à maintenir sa situation.

3. Quant au blocus d'un pays comme la Turquie d'Asie, il paraît illusoire.

Le blocus des côtes de l'Asie Mineure a déjà été écarté par les représentants de la Grèce en mars 1920 comme inefficace, difficile à exercer en raison de l'étendue de la frontière maritime et de nature à aggraver la situation précaire du ravitaillement de Constantinople. Il n'atteindrait en rien les communications de la Turquie nationaliste avec la Russie soviétique, d'où elle tire son matériel de guerre et une partie de ses subsides. Il n'aurait en définitive aucune influence sur un pays essentiellement agricole, qui se nourrit sur lui-même et dont les besoins économiques sont affranchis des relations extérieures.

En regard de ces moyens, ceux des nationalistes turcs se résument dans le tableau suivant :

Un régime dictatorial mettant entre les mains d'un seul chef, Kemal, tous les pouvoirs.

Une armée de 150.000 combattants environ, susceptible d'atteindre le chiffre de 200.000 hommes, disposant de 700 à 800 canons et de 2.000 à 2.500 mitrailleuses, et répartis actuellement de la façon suivante :

Front hellénique, 110.000 à 120.000 hommes
Front Syrie-Mésopotamie, 5.000 hommes environ
Front du Caucase, 10.000 hommes
Intérieur, 20.000 hommes

Alors que les moyens des Alliés et des Grecs ont depuis 1920 subi une diminution très notable, les troupes kémalistes se sont accrues en effectifs et en valeur militaire. Leur force morale est celle de gens qui combattent pour leur pays et dans leur pays.

III

Il résulte de cet exposé qu'en présence de la force nationaliste actuelle, les Alliés, avec la coopération des Grecs, ne peuvent guère que maintenir leurs positions dans les Détroits et sur le front de Smyrne—et encore à la condition que l'armée grecque échappe à la désagrégation.

Les moyens militaires dont ils disposent ne leur permettent qu'une attitude défensive, c'est-à-dire passive, sur ces fronts. Le seul moyen auquel ils pourraient avoir recours, réside dans le blocus, et l'on a vu que ce blocus est condamné à l'inefficacité. Par suite, les Alliés semblent dans l'impossibilité d'exercer une action coercitive efficace pour réduire la résistance turque.

Mais la continuation de la lutte contre le nationalisme ne risque pas seulement de faire éclater l'impuissance des Alliés, elle comporte en outre des dangers.

Le maintien de l'occupation de Constantinople et des Détroits, sans être de nature à faire céder le Gouvernement d'Angora, aura pour résultat de ruiner davantage le prestige du Gouvernement de Constantinople et du Khalifat et de rejeter définitivement en Asie le Gouvernement effectif de la Turquie.

La maintien des Grecs sur le front de Smyrne entretiendra et développera l'exaltation du sentiment national turc, et continuera à fournir au Gouvernement kémaliste le levier nécessaire pour soutenir et augmenter son effort militaire.

Enfin, la politique de correction à l'égard du Gouvernement d'Angora aboutira infailliblement à consolider l'alliance tacite, mais rendue ainsi plus nécessaire, du pouvoir soviétique et du nationalisme turc. Il est même à prévoir que Mustafa Kemal, par son attitude, sera amené à reprendre la politique ainsi

programmée par le nationalisme et le panislamisme, sera amené à reprendre la politique ainsi

programmée par le nationalisme et le panislamisme, sera amené à reprendre la politique ainsi

Puissances musulmanes qui s'opposent à la réalisation du pacte national. La France et surtout l'Angleterre.

Rapport du 27 mars 1921 par M. L. L. pour le Comité, 12.10.21, 12.10.21.

IV

Les entreprises militaires à prévoir comme résultantes de ces conséquences politiques semblent pouvoir viser les objectifs suivants :

Offensive contre les Grecs pour les Grecs pour les expulser d'Asie
Offensive contre les Détroits
Actions politico-militaires

Au Caucase pour interdire aux Puissances alliées toute ingérence dans cette région si intéressante pour elles au point de vue économique.

En Arabie contre la Syrie et la Mésopotamie.

Vers l'Orient à travers la Perse dans la direction des Indes.

Il est difficile de prévoir dans quelle mesure ces entreprises pourraient être poursuivies simultanément. Il est même probable qu'elles ne se développeront que successivement.

En tout cas, l'offensive contre les Grecs est l'opération vers laquelle le Gouvernement d'Angora concentre manifestement ses efforts à l'heure actuelle, afin de

sa révolte. Sans exagérer les possibilités turques, ni sous-estimer la capacité de résistance de l'armée hellénique, on ne peut envisager sans crainte de catastrophe la reprise des attaques kémalistes. Mustafa Kemal se prépare en effet à mettre en ligne contre la Grèce, non seulement ses réserves, mais encore des contingents turkomanes, afghans, etc., dont des traités récents lui promettent de concours offensif et défensif. Dans ces conditions, la situation d'équilibre instable qui caractérise le front turco-hellénique moralement atteinte.

Un succès de cette nature ne manquerait pas d'exalter les Turcs. Il pourrait les amener à une entreprise contre les Détroits visant tout au moins à en border la rive méridionale que les forces alliées, trop faibles et privées de toute protection sur leur flanc droit, ne sauraient défendre contre une attaque aérienne.

Mais surtout, la menace qu'une armée nationaliste hostile fait peser sur la situation militaire des Alliés en Syrie et en Mésopotamie prendrait un caractère particulièrement inquiétant du jour où cette armée débarrassée du front hellénique, ou simplement résolue à le manquer, prononcerait un effort de ce côté.

Dans cette hypothèse, les Turcs pourraient facilement, au moyen de leurs réserves concentrées en direction de Mossoul, une force d'au moins 50.000 hommes, suffisante pour menacer les entreprises britanniques, mais aussi pour porter un coup sérieux à l'œuvre de

Il paraît inutile enfin d'insister sur les dangers que comporte pour l'Empire des

de donner appui à travers la Perse et l'Afghanistan, aux mouvements séditionnels qui agitent déjà cet Empire. Des entreprises de cette nature sont actuellement en préparation en particulier par l'action de Djemal Pacha en Afghanistan ;

V.

En Résumé

Toute action militaire coercitive des Alliés vis-à-vis du Gouvernement d'Angora paraît interite, toute action de blocus paraît inopérante.

Par suite, imposer des conditions qui porteraient atteinte au nationalisme turc, c'est-à-dire qui toucheraient des pays habités par des populations turques, serait

de ne compromettre de l'alliance turco-russe permettrait une diminution des forces aux ordres de

le Kemaliste

Angleterre ne dispose en Mésopotamie que de 1 D.I.

12 bataillons
6 batteries

8 escadrons
6 groupes d'aviation

Djemal Pacha, avec l'aide d'une mission turque importante, a entrepris la constitution d'une armée

l'Angleterre par la frontière de l'ouest. Il dirige une entreprise analogue en Perse et se propose d'attaquer

par l'est les Anglais de Mésopotamie.

[8975]

de faire éclater leur impuissance à la réduire, et même de compromettre leur maintien sur leurs positions actuelles en Asie Mineure.

Un tel échec, en outre, de ses conséquences locales et européennes, aurait des répercussions graves sur le mouvement nationaliste turc sur les Puissances alliées ne pourrait manquer en effet de réveiller et d'exalter le fanatisme religieux, et, avec lui, l'esprit d'indépendance des populations musulmanes dans les royaumes arabes et aux Indes, et de provoquer des mouvements de révolte dont le développement peut dépasser les prévisions.

Ce sont là, semble-t-il, les considérations militaires qui doivent inspirer les Puissances alliées dans les prochaines négociations.

Paris le 1^{er} février 1922

Annexe 3. — No 1

Rapport établi par les Représentants militaires et navals au sujet des Moyens militaires à mettre en œuvre pour faire exécuter le Traité de Paix avec la Turquie dans le cas où le Gouvernement ottoman refuserait de signer, de ratifier ou d'exécuter ce Traité.

L'EXECUTION du Traité de Paix avec la Turquie—dans ses clauses essentielles telles qu'elles résultent des renseignements reçus du Conseil suprême—semble comporter de la part des Alliés les réalisations suivantes :

1. Prise de possession des territoires à concéder par la Turquie ou à neutraliser.
2. Actions à entreprendre dans le reste de l'Empire, en vue d'imposer la démobilisation des forces turques, la livraison de l'armement, et de sauvegarder, dans la mesure du possible, l'existence des minorités.

Les prises de possession à réaliser peuvent être définies ainsi qu'il suit :

1. Thrace
2. Zone des Détroits
3. Zone de Smyrne
4. Territoire situé au sud de la nouvelle frontière turco-syrienne
5. Mésopotamie.*
6. Etat indépendant d'Arménie, à libérer des forces turques qui l'occupent.

Les moyens militaires à mettre en œuvre pour ces opérations peuvent être évalués comme suit :

I. Thrace

La Thrace turque à l'ouest des lignes de Tchatalja est actuellement occupée par 3 à 4 D.I. turques à effectif réduit†, ces divisions pourraient être rapidement ramenées sur le pied de guerre‡.

On doit donc admettre qu'un effectif de 4 D.I. § serait nécessaire pour réduire ces forces turques à l'impuissance, les contraindre à l'évacuation, assurer l'occupation du pays et pourvoir au maintien de l'ordre.

En raison de son importance, cette prise de possession de la Thrace devrait revêtir un caractère interallié.

A ce titre, elle devrait être placée sous une direction alliée et exécutée par une force constituée en majorité par des éléments helléniques.

* L'occupation du Kurdistan n'est pas mentionnée, aucune décision n'ayant été communiquée au C. M. A. V. au sujet du statut futur de ce pays. Il n'est pas davantage fait mention de la partie de l'Arménie comprise entre le Caucase et le Kurdistan.

† Djafar Teyef Bey, Gouverneur d'Adrianople, vient de lancer l'ordre de mobilisation générale, à la suite des événements de Constantinople. Il disposerait d'un armement et de réserves de munitions importantes.

2. Zone des Détroits.

La conférence tenue à Londres le 16 février par les représentants navals et militaires a conclu à la nécessité de maintenir à la portée des Détroits environ 2 D.I. tant que ne seront pas réalisées les dispositions prévues par les clauses du Traité de Paix.

Ces propositions ont été agréées par le Conseil suprême.

Il y a lieu de les maintenir dans l'hypothèse envisagée.

3. Zone de Smyrne

Trois D.I. helléniques (sur les six qui se trouvent actuellement sur place) semblent suffisantes pour maintenir la possession définitive de l'ensemble de la zone attribuée à la Grèce.

4. Territoire au sud de la Frontière turco-syrienne

Trois divisions françaises de l'armée du Levant sont déjà à pied d'œuvre. Une quatrième D.I. serait sans doute nécessaire pour achever la prise de possession du territoire cédé, couvrir efficacement la voie ferrée Alep-Nisibin.

5. Mésopotamie.

Cette région est déjà tenue par les forces britanniques (valeur 2 D.I.).

6. Arménie

Le territoire du futur Etat arménien est actuellement occupé par 4 D.I. turques, disposant de moyens matériels importants.*

Ces divisions peuvent être renforcées par de nombreux irréguliers.

Avec les faibles forces dont elle dispose, l'Arménie n'est pas en état d'assurer sa souveraineté, et de résister aux attaques possibles des Turcs de l'Azerbeïdjan.

Il serait donc indispensable :

(a) De lui donner sans retard, l'appui d'une force alliée capable de contraindre les Turcs à l'évacuation. En raison de l'étendue du pays, de sa structure montagneuse, des travaux à entreprendre pour assurer les communications, cette force peut être estimée à 4 D.I. au minimum.

(b) De lui fournir le plus rapidement possible le moyen d'organiser et de développer ses propres forces (instructeurs, armement et matériel).

Pour assurer le transport en Arménie des forces alliées d'intervention, ainsi que le ravitaillement en vivres et matériel de ces forces et des troupes arméniennes, il y aurait lieu de prendre pour bases : d'une part, le port de Trébizonde donnant accès sur la région d'Erzeroum, et d'autre part, le port de Batoum et la Géorgie, de manière à disposer de la route et de la voie ferrée Batoum-Tiflis-Erzeroum.

L'utilisation de ces bases et communications exigerait au préalable un accord.

En résumé, les forces à prévoir pour assurer la prise de possession des territoires à réaliser sont les suivantes :

Thrace	4 D.I.
Détroits	2 D.I.
Smyrne	3 D.I.
Frontière nord de Syrie	4 D.I.
Mésopotamie	2 D.I.
Arménie	4 D.I.
Total	19 D.I.

II

Les prises de possession envisagées ci-dessus ne désarmeront pas l'adversaire. Des actions sont donc également à prévoir pour lui imposer la démobilisation de

* Matériel resté sur place et provenant des principales armées turques qui opèrent dans ces régions, entre l'Armée russe du Caucase.

† 15.000 hommes insuffisamment armés et dépourvus de matériel.

‡ L'opportunité de fournir à l'Arménie un appui effectif s'impose d'autant plus qu'il importe d'insister le plus possible sur la nécessité de la démobilisation.

forces, la limitation de son armement et de son matériel et pour sauvegarder dans la mesure du possible l'existence des minorités.

On ne peut envisager dans ce but une opération à caractère décisif qui risquerait d'entraîner les Alliés jusqu'au cœur de l'Asie Mineure, dans un pays de faibles ressources dépourvu de communications, où les contingents turcs pourraient organiser et prolonger la lutte de guérilla, mais où des colonnes européennes importantes auraient peine à subsister et à se mouvoir.

Le résultat visé pourra être plus utilement recherché par une entreprise solidement assurée sur les régions vitales de l'Empire ottoman, en vue de priver l'ennemi des contingents, des ressources matérielles et des communications qu'elles possèdent.

L'occupation de la région limitée à l'est par la grande transversale Haidar Pacha-Alexandrette et, éventuellement celle de la voie ferrée d'Angora, répondrait à ce but.

Elle exigerait les effectifs suivants :

Région d'Eski-Cheir	1 D.I.
Prolongement sur Angora	2 D.I.
Région d'Akioum-Karshissar	2 D.I.
Région de Kadin*	1 D.I.
Troupes chargées des communications	2 D.I.

Au total 8 D.I.

Il y aurait lieu, en outre, d'envisager une action des forces navales alliées, tendant à assurer la main mise sur les îles turques et le contrôle avec la participation des forces militaires, des ports de Trébizonde, Rizeh, Samsun, Karasund, Sinope, Janid Madana, Panderma, Rodosto et Silivri.

Au total les différentes réalisations envisagées aux chapitres I et II exigeraient la mise en œuvre de 19 D.I. plus 8 D.I. = 27 D.I.

III

(a) La poursuite des deux buts : prise de possession des territoires, désarmement de l'adversaire, peut être envisagée soit *successivement*, soit *simultanément*.

Des efforts successifs présenteraient de sérieux inconvénients : liberté d'action laissée à l'ennemi, possibilité pour lui de provoquer de nouveaux massacres parmi les populations non musulmanes.

Us auraient d'autre part pour effet de prolonger la durée de l'intervention alliée, puisque le transport des troupes d'un théâtre d'opérations à un autre exigerait nécessairement de longs délais, en raison des distances et de la lenteur des communications.

Il serait donc désirable que les opérations fussent autant que possible, *entreprises simultanément dans les diverses zones* et que leur préparation fût activement poussée dès maintenant de manière que les Alliés soient en mesure d'agir immédiatement en profitant de la saison favorable dans le cas où le Gouvernement turc refuserait de signer, de ratifier ou d'exécuter le traité.

(b) Pour organiser et conduire ces opérations avec méthode, il conviendrait d'actes part :

De maintenir sous un commandement particulier les troupes alliées opérant en Turquie d'Europe.

De placer sous une même direction d'ensemble toutes les troupes alliées appelées à opérer concentriquement du Bosphore au Taurus.

Quant aux forces de Syrie, Cilicie, de Mésopotamie et d'Arménie, elles devraient en raison de leurs missions spéciales, conserver leur commandement distinct, mais coopérant, dans leur zone propre, à l'action générale des troupes d'Asie Mineure.

Forces de Cilicie. Il prendrait

difficile à exécuter en raison de l'absence de routes, et de nature à aggraver la situation déjà difficile de la région de Constantinople.

Le représentant turc a fait observer qu'il serait prudent de prévoir en outre une réserve d'urgence.

En tenant compte de cette observation, le total des forces alliées à prévoir s'élèverait ainsi à environ 30 D.I.

Enfin, pour coordonner les actions entreprises sur des théâtres d'opérations aussi distincts, le Conseil suprême des Gouvernements aurait à imprimer une direction supérieure.

IV

Pour réaliser le programme exposé ci-dessus, les Alliés disposent à pied d'œuvre des forces suivantes :

Forces françaises	..	5 D.I. incomplets (y compris la 1 ^{re} D.I.)
Forces italiennes	..	1 D.I. " (y compris la 4 ^e D.I.)
Forces helléniques	..	9 D.I. (6 en Syrie, 3 en Europe).
Total	..	15 D.I., dont 6 incomplets.

Il en exige 27 ce qui comporterait un renforcement de 12 D.I.

Ce renforcement ne peut être, dans les circonstances actuelles, demandé à la France à la Grande-Bretagne ou à l'Italie.

La Grèce ne pourrait y satisfaire que partiellement en mettant en ligne toutes ses disponibilités de l'intérieur préalablement remobilisées (5 D.I.).

Il convient de remarquer que les forces helléniques constituent déjà près de la moitié des forces alliées actuellement disponibles dans les territoires turcs d'Europe et d'Asie.

Il faut donc envisager la possibilité d'obtenir un renforcement supplémentaire d'ailleurs, pour résultat probable d'exaspérer le sentiment nationaliste et xénophobe des populations ottomanes, et de donner à la lutte un caractère d'acharnement qui en augmenterait les difficultés.

Si l'Entente bornait son effort à la mise en œuvre de ses seules forces disponibles (15 D.I.), elle devrait par suite se limiter à une exécution partielle du programme.

Maintien et consolidation des occupations déjà réalisées.

Prise de possession des territoires à neutraliser ou à concéder par la Turquie en Europe et en Asie Mineure occidentale.

Main mise sur le système des communications de cette dernière partie de l'Empire ottoman.

Malgré ces conditions, la situation de l'Arménie ne serait pas réglée, par ailleurs que les clauses réduisant la Turquie à une impuissance militaire, puisque cet état pourrait envisager d'occuper l'Arménie et trouver en outre dans toute la partie centrale et orientale de l'Asie Mineure la possibilité de recruter ses forces, de les alimenter et de peser sur les minorités.

C'est dire que l'exécution intégrale du traité ne peut être assurée, semble-t-il, notamment dans la Turquie d'Asie orientale, que par une intervention de forces alliées plus importante que celles actuellement disponibles, au besoin demandées aux États-Unis.

France.	Grande-Bretagne	Italie.	Japon.
	Le Major-General Sackville-West.	Pour le Major-General Cavallero.	Le Général Watanabe.
	Représentant mili- taire permanent, (Signé) SACKVILLE-WEST.	Représentant mili- taire permanent, (Signé) BASSETTO.	Représentant mili- taire permanent, (Signé) WATANABE.
Le Contre-Amiral Le Vavascur. (Signé) LE VAVASSEUR.	Le Capitaine du Vaisseau Fuller. (Signé) F. L. FULLER.	L'Amiral Grassi. (Signé) GRASSI.	Pour le Capitaine de Vaisseau Ogawa (Signé) TAJOSHIMA.

Reserve du Représentant militaire britannique

Paragraphe III (b) Le représentant militaire britannique ne peut pas accepter le paragraphe tel qu'il est écrit dans le rapport, et il propose l'une des deux modifications suivantes:

1. Ajouter, après les mots "du Bosphore au Taurus" les mots "y compris les troupes d'occupation de Constantinople"

ou

2. Remplacer tout le paragraphe *III (b)*, par la phrase suivante:

"Pour organiser et conduire des opérations avec méthode, il conviendrait d'autre part d'établir dans la mesure du possible un haut commandement unique."

Le 27 mars 1920

Enclosure 4 in No 23.

Forces alliées des Détroits

1. France

6 bataillons

5 à Constantinople et environs

1 à Gallipoli

1 escadron de Stahls

1 groupe d'artillerie de campagne

2. Grande Bretagne

6 bataillons

4 indiens

2 britanniques

1 escadron de cavalerie

1 group d'artillerie de campagne

3. Italie

2 bataillons

E 1163 75 447

No 34

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Lord Hardinge (Paris).

Foreign Office, February 1 1922
to the Turkish gendarmerie which herewith, for your information, I enclose a despatch from His Majesty's High Commissioner in Constantinople to the Governor of Constantinople.

2. It will be within your Lordship's recollection that in its note to you of the 14th November last, the French Government gave specific assurances that:—

- (1) M. Franklin-Bouillon had not demanded or obtained any monopoly, or promise of monopoly, of gendarmerie organisation in Turkey.
- (2) The Franklin-Bouillon agreement had not modified Lieutenant-Colonel Sarrail's position.
- (3) The French Government considered the Allied agreements to remain in force in their entirety, General Filonov's appointment and the character of his mission remaining unaltered.

3. It now appears, however, that in spite of these specific pledges the French Government has been endeavouring to secure the appointment of a French gendarme in the districts outside the Straits zone, and indeed in the districts of Constantinople.

* Not printed.

instructions from the French Government. Lieutenant-Colonel Sarrail refuses to take orders from General Filonov, who he recognises as being concerned only with the gendarmerie inside the zone of the Straits. He does not hesitate to give orders both of the head of the Turkish gendarmerie.

Indeed, so impossible has Lieutenant-Colonel Sarrail rendered the situation at Constantinople that Sir Charles Harington has requested Lieutenant-Colonel Sarrail may be withdrawn.

4. His Majesty's Government are totally unable to reconcile the proceedings of Lieutenant-Colonel Sarrail and the explanations of the acting French High Commissioner at Constantinople with the assurances contained in the French note of the 14th November. They desire to register an emphatic protest against Lieutenant Sarrail's proceedings and against the support that the French Government gives him, and they will be glad to receive advice from your Lordship on the whole matter at an early date.

5. There is also the further question of the gendarmerie in Cilicia, to which the French Government has apparently handed over arms and aeroplanes despite the Allied declaration of neutrality of the 10th August last. His Majesty's Government would be grateful if your Lordship will address a note to the French Government in the above sense.

I am, Sir,

CURZON OF KEDLESTON

E 1306 5 44

No. 25

Memorandum on Italian Proposals for Revision of Financial Clauses of Sykes Treaty

AN interdepartmental meeting was held on the 3rd February, attended by Mr. Armitage-Smith, C.B. (Treasury), in the chair, Mr. Hutchinson (Board of Trade), Mr. Wanklyn and Mr. Forster Adams (Foreign Office).

The Italian proposals* were carefully considered clause by clause. The main objection to them was felt to be as follows:—

1. Italian intention (article 232 and 232 bis) appears to be to turn the Commission to a reparation commission to obtain the payment of a war indemnity from Turkey, and for this purpose to control the collection and payment of certain specified revenues assigned to the service of that indemnity. It is no longer to administer the whole revenue and expenditure of Turkey as under the Treaty of Sevres. Yet this reparation commission is given various wider powers quite unnecessary for its main task, such as making suggestions to the Turkish Parliament on the Turkish budget, through a complete control of the service of Turkish financial inspectors, and improving the Turkish currency (article 233), and having a veto on new concessions and on the prolongation of old concessions (article 239). Although the main purpose and function (collection of a war indemnity) of the new Financial Commission does not differ in importance from those of the pre-war Debt Council, it is still made to swallow the latter as under the Treaty of Sevres (article 246).

2. In short, the Italians appear merely to have concentrated on obtaining certain powers to secure their advantages under the tripartite agreement and left the treaty otherwise more or less as it stood with a few drafting alterations. The result is an illogical scheme which would probably remain as objectionable as the Sevres financial clauses to Turkey without having the merits of the latter, namely, some provision for the fundamental economic reconstruction of Turkey.

3. Objection was also seen by the meeting to the particular revenues selected for allocation to the service of the war indemnity (particularly the customs) which appear to absorb all the most easily encashed sources of Turkish revenue and thus leave little over for Turkey's budget.

* See No. 21

a) Aim at restoring Turkey's financial and economical prosperity on the line of

to be secured by the payment of Allied war claims by a reparation to the Debt Council and by

Turkish administration except in

This course, coupled with an agreement between the All-

Failing this, the Board of Trade would have some amendments to propose in the

Owing to the preponderant British claims for recovery of expenses of military

8. The political situation appears to make (a) impossible of attainment unless it

[illegible]

...a Government might promise the Italians this post, as part of the arrangement

...the importance of keeping Italian support during the negotiations by

General Office, Washington, D. C. 20540

1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 2680, 26

No. 26.

THE INSTITUTIONS PROPAGATING THE BELIEFS OF BRITAIN'S ELITE 19

1—F. HANSEN AND K. HANSEN, *Journal of Polymer Science*, **10**, 1 (1953).

3.4.4. *Sanctions and economic blockade of Turkey*

...and blockade would not greatly
...of the financial help of

in peace settling

various terms as to expend to \$ 100,000.00

and the little by little, as the

It means, then, that the only blockade of Turkey which would engulf her in one

endure long to subjugation without the usual of any great race blockade. Turkey knows

TABLE 1. *Continued*

4. _____

4. There appears to be no likelihood that any of the 48 men would allow their names

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to the study of the asymptotic behavior of the solutions of the system (1) as $t \rightarrow \infty$. It is shown that the solutions of the system (1) tend to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$ if and only if the matrix A is stable. The second part of the paper is devoted to the study of the asymptotic behavior of the solutions of the system (1) as $t \rightarrow \infty$ if the matrix A is not stable. It is shown that the solutions of the system (1) tend to infinity as $t \rightarrow \infty$ if and only if the matrix A is not stable.

A — not agree to allow Gower to purchase military material from them; does —

779

6. The one modification of the treaty to which I have referred is one which

[illegible]

which the Tucks really attach to the plant, etc., is to be found on the flowers. But, these

189751

7. The definite termination by the Allies of Turkish rule in Constantinople, it can hardly be doubted, would be a severe blow to Kemalism. But even supposing the situation in India to allow His Majesty's Government thus to reverse the Cabinet decision of January 1920, and even supposing such an agreement to have been reached and between the Allies, much of the consequent effect would depend on the attitude of Russia, who, after Turkey, is the Power most profoundly concerned in the Straits. We could give Russia reason to think that the expulsion of the Turk would control over Constantinople and the Straits, which suited her better, than the Turkish body as the Straits.

It would be less likely to continue her support of Turkey, and we might hope to see Kemalism crumble. But if the alternative arrangement seemed to her to be the prelude to, say, Greek occupation of Constantinople, she would doubtless support Turkey in fighting it tooth and nail. In that case the expulsion of the Turk from Europe would have brought us no nearer to the establishment of peace in Anatolia. It seems, then, that here, again, the attitude of Russia is all-important.

IV - Separation of Constantinople Government from Angora Government

8. Sir H. Russell has suggested that, as a last resource, if a reasonable settlement, peace might be made with the moderate element would gradually melt away from Mustafa's hands and in a minority. This procedure failed when the Sultan's Government signed the Treaty of Sevres, but it might run a better chance of success with a treaty in favour of Turkey to the extent now proposed.

V. - Definite Annexation of Turkish Territory by Allies by Unilateral Declaration

9. There are believed to be legal precedents which would justify the Allies in agreeing among themselves to consider such and such a settlement to be at once in force irrespective of Turkish acceptance, e.g., definite severance of Thrace and the Arab countries from Turkey. But an arrangement of this kind would leave the position very much as it is to-day. It would abandon Ankara to stew in her own juices. It ought to be possible to combine this step with the evacuation of Constantinople and with an Allied occupation of the Smyrna zone with the troops so withdrawn from Constantinople. If Greek troops were withdrawn from Smyrna without Allied occupation, the Greek Government would be left to their fate. In any case, Mustafa would continue to be the tribes against Mesopotamia. Anatolia, too, would remain closed to British trade, and in these days the recovery of those markets must be one of our most

10. Without the definite separation of Russia from Turkey, the indirect methods of pressure on Angora open to the Allies would probably be in the nature of palliatives to keep Greece in the field rather than to end Angora's resistance. It is possible, however, but not certain, that an offer of generous concessions to Turkey, combined with some clear indication that the Allies were united and prepared in the last resort to use the indirect means of pressure on Turkey and help to the Greeks indicated above, might make Mustafa think it worth while to yield.

Annex

Guarantees for Greek Population in event of unconditional Greek evacuation of Smyrna

1. If sovereignty and full executive power remains Turkish, it seems only a delusion to think that there can be any absolutely effective guarantee. All we can do is to reduce the chances of trouble. It will perhaps be more convenient to consider the temporary measures necessary to tide over and follow evacuation by the Greeks, separately from the guarantees of a more permanent nature.

Temporary Measures.

2. We have seen that the Turkish Government is at present in a very weak position. The present Turkish Government is suggested by the present Turkish Government as suggested by the present Turkish Government.

is months in the outer zone, and a year in the inner zone, would be of some moral value, but a stronger Allied military force than the proposed "guard" would be above transition period in each zone, if troops can be spared. Above periods in each zone, it might perhaps be stipulated that the only platoon to show the flag in Smyrna, Brusa. This would be a sop to Turkish prestige, but

Permanent Measures.

3. The most important of all the permanent safeguards is that of making provision for a large proportion of foreign troops to be applied in the Smyrna zone. Possibly all this will ensure that the world at large will not readily be used for measures of wholesale persecution. The presence of these forces will be a better safeguard than that of consuls.

4. The minorities provisions of the Sevres Treaty are likely to remain for the most part a dead letter, at any rate outside the sphere where foreign influence may be sought to bear. Nevertheless it seems important to maintain them. We should probably be able to obtain Turkish acceptance by making them applicable to cases where Turks have grievances against the Greeks. Mixed commissions of enquiry, with a chairman appointed by the League of Nations are, under these clauses, to enquire into deportations and to rehabilitate victims in their homes. The Turkish Government would probably be glad to accept these conditions if the Turks could profit. It would be worth while to make some such concession in order to get the Turkish court of law would certainly be too pressed to deal with it. The mere presence, however, of these commissions in the districts will help to bring them within the pale of civilization and to make the perpetration of horrors rather less likely.

Adrianople and Smyrna

5. Turkish law as it already stands provides for representation of all races on local councils, e.g., the Smyrna Vilayet Council, the Smyrna M. C. and the Ayah Kaza Council. Turkish law also admits all races to the same rights and privileges. The principles in the Smyrna zone.

6. The creation of any special separate status for Adrianople and Smyrna seems impracticable and on the whole undesirable. Economically both places are dependent on the surrounding country. Administratively it would be hard to find any Western precedent (e.g., Hamburg, Fiume, Zara, Danzig) the working of which would be applicable to an Eastern town, and to cities without the traditions of a separate corporate existence behind them. Alexandria has a special municipal constitution for purely municipal administrative purposes, but it is cumbersome and is understood not to have worked very well. In any case, it was primarily designed to give a large share of control to the foreign European element—hardly existent in Adrianople.

Foreign Office, February 6, 1922

Memorandum by Mr. Ryan on Turkish Peace Prospects

PEACE with the present Ankara Government is impossible except on the basis of a settlement which has not yet been reached. I have done before reaching the French note of the 27th January, as if that note is an authorised exposition of the Ankara point of view, my statement becomes too sweeping. Nevertheless, I still believe it to be substantially true.

Peace with the Sultan's Government is useless unless and until its authority is restored over some respectable portion of Anatolia.

As regards Ankara, recent indications point (a) to a definite rapprochement between Mustafa Kemal and the Bolsheviks and (b) to the existence in Ankara itself of a fairly strong opposition to Mustafa Kemal. He has kept the upper hand so far, and it is impossible to appraise the value of the various elements in the opposition. But one of them does seem to consist of persons who hanker after a more conservative attitude towards the Sultan.

4. The Constantinople Government is so impotent that it is practically impossible to speak of its attitude. Views expressed by its members have no value as expressions of personal opinion, not necessarily.

5. All Turks who count for anything in the settlement are solid for securing the evacuation of Asia Minor and as much as possible of Eastern Thrace by the Greeks. As regards the western portion of Eastern Thrace, it is mainly a question of the town of Adrianople, which is a matter of prestige and intensely strong sentiment.

6. The Turkish administration, just as it is, is a development reduced to nil or to a minimum. The same applies to foreign intervention in the question of the minority. The extent to which such control and intervention can be imposed depends on the extent to which the Allies are prepared in the last resort to see their settlement through by force.

7. If Mustafa Kemal maintains his ascendancy, the alternatives before the Allies are—

- To capitulate and to agree to the substance of the National Pact.
- To offer the terms which they themselves desire, and if rejected, to join issue with Ankara without further delay.
- To endeavour to promote the transference of power from Mustafa Kemal to more moderate elements and by making peace with these elements to avoid the necessity for coercion.

8. It is unnecessary for me to discuss alternatives (a) and (c). We may be won down to (a) or Allied clamour may reduce us in practice to (c), but neither of them has anything to recommend it positively. As for (b), it would mean at the very least giving both moral and material support to the Greeks, which would defeat one of our main objects—that of conciliating Moslem opinion generally. It would probably involve even more, namely, direct Allied military effort.

9. Alternative (d) presents to my mind definite advantages, if Allied unity can be maintained. It would involve the removal of Mustafa Kemal and the Nationalists. This would have to come partly from within Anatolia. The anti-Nationalist opposition in Constantinople is worthless. The Sultan's authority, though a factor, is too weak to enable the Allies to redress the balance between Constantinople and Ankara by direct action. They would do more harm than good.

10. The adjustment of internal forces by means of a constructive policy. The conditions are such that, if the Sultan could come into the open, with the support of the Nationalists and gradually re-establish his authority.

11. The procedure to be followed by the Allies would be a matter of the utmost importance. They must not compromise the Sultan's chances of success by giving

the appearance of a bond-slave of the Powers or an ally of the Greeks. They must allow for the constitutional difficulty of his ratifying a treaty without a Parliament, which is a real one. They must offer the best terms they can, but they must at the same time show that they are the best terms available for Turkey, and that every effort on their part to get more will be resisted by every means, including the ultimate use of force, if necessary.

12. Assuming that an agreement can be arrived at between the three Great Allied Powers, the best procedure might be to embody the main lines of it, but not all the details, in an Act exchanged between them, and to invite the Turks and the Greeks to adhere to this Act as a preliminary to the assembling of a new conference of the three Powers, the Turks and the Greeks, which conference would discuss the reserved questions of detail and draw up a new treaty. In drawing up such an Act it would be essential to make it clear for the benefit of Moslem opinion generally and of all Turks, but especially Turks of moderate tendency—

- That the three Powers desired to make every concession to Turkey compatible with their own interests and their obligations elsewhere.
- That the Allies sought to hold the scale evenly between Turks and Greeks.
- That the three Powers looked to moderate elements grouped round the Sultan for acceptance of the terms offered, even if Ankara, as at present constituted, should reject them.
- That the Allies really meant to use coercive measures in the last resort.

13. In order to make it clear what I mean, I have prepared the attached draft of an Act of the kind I have in view. It is obviously of the most tentative description. Its eventual form would have to be the result of close and detailed discussion.

ANDREW RYAN

A note

Draft of Act as suggested by Mr. Ryan

The three Powers, animated by a common desire for the pacification of the Near East, subscribed to a preliminary Act as follows:—

1. The three Powers desire to promote the establishment of a stable and durable Turkish State under the sovereignty of the Sultan, subject to such constitutional arrangements as concerned themselves to the Turkish people.

2. The three Powers desire to give satisfaction to the national aspirations of the Turkish people, to ensure the protection of racial and religious minorities, and the freedom of the State.

3. The three Powers regard the Caliphate as a matter of exclusive Islamic concern. They declare, so far as they are concerned, that they will not influence Moslems subject to their authority or inhabiting their countries under their mandate to refuse to recognise the Caliphate of Constantinople, or promote the setting up of any other Caliphate in opposition to that of Constantinople. They reaffirm their intention to ensure the exercise of the special rights of Moslems in matters of personal status and matters of purely religious concern, and to ensure respect for Wakf foundations in territory detached from Turkey, subject to the exercise by the sovereign authorities of such territory of rights of supervision similar to those formerly exercised by the Turkish Government.

4. The three Powers propose the following basis of a peace settlement between that part of Turkey which is at war with Greece and between the Allies generally and Turkey:—

- The European frontier of Turkey shall be the Enos-Midia line.*

* (a) and (b) represent an attempt to combine Sir H. K. Rumbold's view, that any Turkish Government will accept with His Majesty's Government, that the French, who have been in close touch with Ankara, have the Galipoli Peninsula might well modify Sir H. Rumbold's view, and that Constantinople a fortnight ago in order the Turks to the Anatolian front.

The territory included between the Enos-Midia line and the Midia-Rodost-
mainenance of public order by a force of gendarmerie, to be organized under
supervision of the Sub-Committee of Gendarmerie established at

A 36 of the Treaty of Sevres, relative to Constantinople shall be
Article 37 + 1, relative to the Straits, shall be maintained
principle, subject to the discussion of any points of detail raised by
Turkish Government with a view to reconciling them with the principle

A 36 of the Treaty of Sevres shall be revised in an
agreements of the Greek Government in regard to
status of Asia

(f) The creation of a special regime for
and an area to be determined later

(f) The Asiatic land frontier of Turkey shall be the
Franco-Kemalist Agreement, the northern frontier
down in the Treaty of Sevres, subject to a
agreed upon by the British, Turkish and Greek
Turco-Persian frontier and the old Russo-Turkish frontier

(g) The three Powers desire to place the protection of racial and religious
minorities in Turkey and New Greece under the supervision of the League
the same objects, as far as possible, by the
as are laid down in the treaties concluded between the Allies
Having regard, however, to the acuteness
to the remoteness of the places affected, and to
the consequences of the deplorable events of the last eight years, they
consider it necessary

(i) That the League of Nations should have the right to maintain
or travelling representatives in such parts of Turkey
New Greece as the Council of the League think fit
traditional privileges of the non Moslem communities in
shall be maintained intact and
special provisions on the lines of articles 142 and 144 of the
Treaty of Sevres should be made in order to repair
the consequences of the policy pursued by
Turkish Government during the period of hostilities

(h) The

(i) The way as to reconcile the principle of Turkish sovereignty with the
of control necessary to ensure the payment of Turkish debts to the
of war claims, and the development of the resources of
expedite the payment of those claims
treatment in Turkey in respect of
safeguards against excessive

(j) The

(i) The maintenance as a provisional measure of a judicial system for
Allied subjects based on the Capitulations and the recent
arrangements for a Mixed Court

(j) The institution as soon as possible for the Capitulations of a
system providing the safeguards necessary to protect the
personal liberty and property of Allied subjects until such
as the League of Nations shall consider the judicial system of

* This is simply based on the Treaty of Sevres, but the question is and of course arose whether the
Turks should be allowed to retain the territory in Thrace which was ceded to them under the Treaty of Kars

Turkey to have reached such a level as to make special safe-
guards unnecessary

(m) The maintenance of the jurisdiction of the Consular Courts in
matters exclusively concerning Allied subjects and matters of the
personal status and family rights of Allied subjects

5. As soon as the Greek and Turkish Governments shall have declared their adhesion
to the present Act, the three Powers will be prepared to meet their representatives at a
conference to be held at Constantinople not later than for the
preparation of a new treaty of peace, to which the other Allied Governments will be
invited to adhere after it has been ratified by the parties to the conference. This
conference will also determine the modalities of the retransfer to Turkey of the
territories at present occupied by Greek troops east of the Enos-Midia line and in Asia
Minor.

6. The three Powers mutually pledge themselves to co-operate in all measures of a
present Act in the event of the Governments of Turkey or Greece refusing to
adhere to it.

7. The three Powers recognize that the attitude of the Ankara authorities must be
a material factor in determining the future of the territories in question. They will
endeavour to ensure the
that event, postpone the progress
Government have had a reasonable

8. The three Powers will evacuate Constantinople within six months of the
signature of a new treaty based on the present Act by a Turkish Parliament
the territories to be included thereunder in Turkey and recognize the
authority of the Sultan. They will take such action with the Greek Government
may be necessary to ensure the free election of representatives in such a Parliament
the territories at present occupied by Greece

February 1, 1922

B 1547 S 44]

No. 28

Memorandum by Mr. Ryan respecting the Evacuation of Asia Minor by Greek Troops.

THE Department have asked for my views as to what might be expected to follow
if the Greeks decided to evacuate Asia Minor in the immediate future following on a
refusal of British financial assistance.

2. The gravest feature of this would be that the Bruma and Angora areas would
pass directly under the Kemalist Government. The Central Government has no fears
with which to replace the Greek army, even if they wished to do so. Angora would
rejoice in a crushing victory in Asiatic Turkey and would be less amenable than ever
to Allied terms regarding Thrace or matters of immediate concern to the Allies. The
The Kemalist authorities would doubtless wish to avoid massacre, but
Greeks would probably be harmed by every means short of officially countenanced
massacre, and deportations and sporadic massacres might be expected to occur.

3. The evacuation of Constantinople would also be very seriously menaced
Cilicia and relieved of the necessity for operations against the Greeks, would have a
strong temptation to liquidate the situation at the Dardanelles and in Constantinople.
They might hesitate to attack Allied forces immediately, but nothing except their own
hesitation and their hope of seeing the Allies leave of their own accord need restrain
them. If the Allies showed no inclination to leave of their own accord, the Kemalists

on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus. The French would probably be only too ready in
these circumstances to evacuate Constantinople, and subject to military opinion, I doubt
whether the British forces alone could hold it

... evacuation of Asia Minor might thus easily be the prelude to a settlement of the Greek occupation of Constantinople. This would probably be the end of the Constantinople Government and the present Sultan and the beginning of a new Turco-Greek war in Thrace.

A ... is that the Kemalists might leave Constantinople alone for the present but concentrate their attention on Northern Mesopotamia with a view to the recovery of Mosul, with the object of placing His Majesty's Government in a similar position to that which the French occupied in 1914.

5. While the exact nature of these ulterior consequences must be a matter of speculation, I am convinced that a hurried Greek evacuation of Asia Minor before any attempt at a general settlement, would be fraught with very serious consequences for the British position in the Near East, and would render a peaceful settlement on any terms other than the acceptance of the National Pact almost impossible.

... in an occasion of prestige in Islamic countries. In my opinion, therefore, ... left unturned to deter the Greeks from evacuating Asia Minor precipitately, ... to the interests of the Christians in Asia Minor and their own ... Thrace, an earnest effort should be made to accelerate a general settlement, of which the eventual evacuation of Asia Minor would form part.

February 11, 1922

E 1252 5 44

No. 20

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Lord Hardinge, Paris.

(No. 420.)

My Lord,

Foreign Office, February 11. With reference to your despatch No. 306 of the 3rd February, I find that I have not yet instructed your Excellency to make any reply to the note of the 2nd February from the French President of the Council to me regarding the Eastern question.

2. As your Excellency is aware from my despatch No. 405 of the 5th February, I have already explained to the French Ambassador my gratification at the conciliatory ...

... an Allied agreement on the subject at Paris. Without entering on any details ...

... M. Poincaré and renew an expression of those sentiments. You may say at the same ...

... Governments are faced in securing the cessation of fighting in Asia Minor and the ...

... and, as I informed the ...

... conference, to have ...

... the acceptance of the ...

... Government's ...

... characterised M. ...

E 1680 5 44

No. 30

Sir A. Black to Sir B. Blackett.—(Communicated by Treasury, February 14.)

Provisional Financial Commission of Control,
Constantinople, January 26, 1922.

My dear Blackett

IN my immediately preceding letter I made some general observations about the financial clauses of the Treaty of Sèvres, and in conclusion I stated that Mustapha Kemal and his gang would only accept complete fiscal independence. We must not lose sight of the fact that the extremists of Angora or in Constantinople will not accept the Treaty on the basis as it is. The Turks require greater independence financially, economically and politically than they had before the war. I

am of opinion, therefore, that at the present moment no negotiations on the treaty in general will succeed. I believe that there must be a preliminary step to all negotiations, and that is to settle the territorial questions of Smyrna and Thrace.

I consider that the settlement of these questions is of the greatest urgency, since if the Turkish armies settle them the pretensions of Mustapha Kemal will become impossible than they are to-day.

Another urgent reason for considering this question at an early date is that it is the presence of the Greeks on Turkish territory which gives Mustapha Kemal his influence and power, and the settlement of all the other parts of the treaty will become easier once the extremists at Angora have been deprived of their grievance in respect of the Greeks.

If Mustapha Kemal has been able to mobalise the Anatolian peasants and to ... Smyrna and are in Thrace. It is in order to turn out the Greeks that the Anatolian peasant has been persuaded to fight. He has now ten years of war and wants peace, but he will continue to bear the burden of heavy taxation and of conscription as long as the Greeks are on what he considers to be his own soil. If the question of Smyrna and Thrace are settled it will make a great change in the position of Mustapha Kemal. He will endeavour to impose unacceptable conditions on the Allies.

I ... that in this he should fail. The peasants of Anatolia are not likely to ... him in order to fight against the Sultan or against the Allies for economic or financial advantages which they will not understand and which in the long run will ... affect them detrimentally. The extremists may wish to continue ...

... to take the urgent question ... the Turks of Constantinople, and ... and wait to see what proposals they will make as to the modifications of the clauses of the Treaty of Sèvres, always holding over their head the threat that unless they agree to a reasonable treaty they will not get satisfaction over the questions of Thrace and Smyrna. It is a well known principle that in dealing with the Oriental one should always leave it to him to make the first offer. The French seem to be doing exactly the contrary, and in my humble opinion they will find themselves mistaken. The more you give Mustapha Kemal the more he will ask for, whereas, if the Sultan and the moderates agree to the Treaty of Sèvres with slight modifications, once the Greeks are out of Anatolia and out of Thrace the Kemal Party will disintegrate.

For these reasons I maintain it is of the first necessity for the Allies to come to ... any proposals with regard to the modifications of the other parts of the Treaty of ...

All the Turks who ... a small party ... conviction and Kemalists by necessity ... of moderates as well as the "dishards" ...

In Constantinople, again, there are few Kemalists by conviction. They know well enough that if the Kemalists returned in the plenitude of power to the capital there ... Angora extremists. They are apprehensive of what will happen to them unless they profess to be Kemalists.

If the representatives of Angora and Constantinople could be called up together, preferably to London, or, if not, to Rome, and a fair and acceptable treaty were presented to them with the distinct understanding that this was their last chance and that the alternative would mean a prolongation of the present deadlock, and perhaps the adoption of coercive measures, the moderates, I think, would come into line. There are already divisions in the Angora camp, and I believe that when the Kemalists and ... and the Powers, many of them will show little desire to continue fighting.

Even assuming that there be a deadlock, it should be possible to establish a state of things in Constantinople and in the zone of the Straits vastly superior to the state of things in the Kemal regions, and if Angora still holds out the Anatolian population will eventually come to envy the lot of their more fortunate compatriots in districts

under Allied control, where there would be no conscription and where security and order is maintained, thus enabling every one to go about his business without

to rally round the Sultan

If you think anything I say of any value at the present time, please make use of it
in a discreet manner

Yours sincerely,

ADAM BLACK

E 1664 53 44

No 31

Sir H Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.-(Received

February 13)

(No. 130)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 3, 1922

I HAVE the honour to inform your Lordship that considerable comment has been caused to the local French and Greek press by a formal call paid by Mgr Dolci, the Apostolic delegate at Constantinople, on the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

Mgr Dolci's visit was made in order that he might thank the Patriarchate for the sympathy which it had expressed on the death of the Pope. The visit was reported to have been most cordial, and the Apostolic delegate was accorded the greatest possible honours both on his arrival and on his departure.

This interchange of official courtesies is rendered the more noteworthy, as it is stated to be the first time since the fall of Constantinople that anything of the kind has taken place. The press anticipates great results from these initial steps towards what it hopes will be a better understanding between the two Churches. The "Protonotarius" indeed goes so far as to say that this visit will find an echo in every Orthodox heart.

"for us to continue

division which would not only the religion of Christ, but also the

4. Mgr Dolci is reported to have expressed regret at not being able to converse in

he took the opportunity, however, of quoting a few lines of Homer

I have forwarded a copy of this despatch to the Count de Salis.

I have, &c

HORACE RUMBOLD

E 1667, 5 44

No 32

Sir H Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.-(Received February 14.)

(No. 131.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 3, 1922

IN my despatch No. 31, I informed your Lordship that M. Poincaré, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, was expected to visit Constantinople in the near future, and wished to know whether your Lordship would receive

according to his account, one of them had said that he must refer to his Government, whilst the other had replied that there would be no objection to

proposed visit

2. I subsequently ascertained that Hamid Bey had made these enquiries of my colleagues at least a week before he approached me

3. The French Acting High Commissioner informed Hamid Bey that M. Poincaré would willingly receive Youssouf Kemal Bey, but that the latter could not take part in the forthcoming conference at Paris, although there would be no objection to his being

"dans les conditions"

4. In discussing Youssouf Kemal's project with me, Hamid Bey stated that the Greek Ministers had apparently spared no effort in putting the Greek cause before

the Allied Governments. It was high time that the Nationalists did the same. I said that the proposed visit came a little late in the day but I expressed the opinion

if Youssouf Kemal Bey had real authority to speak on behalf of the Nationalists

3. Hamid Bey said that the visit would be an unofficial one. Youssouf Kemal Bey would be accompanied by two advisers and perhaps two secretaries. As he expressed apprehension regarding the safety of Youssouf Kemal Bey whilst at Constantinople, I expressed my opinion that there was no possibility of the Greek authorities interfering with Youssouf Kemal Bey's movements. I gather that Hamid Bey is afraid that

Youssouf Kemal Bey on his way from Constantinople to Haider Pasha, and I am keeping General Harrington informed of the details of this matter

4. Hamid Bey explained that Youssouf Kemal Bey wished to come to Constantinople. I would no doubt talk with

Y. K. Bey, I informed Hamid Bey accordingly, and the latter appeared

rapidly with which he had received an answer to his enquiry

I have, &c

HORACE RUMBOLD

High Commissioner

E 1669 18 44)

No 33

Sir H Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.-(Received February 14)

(No. 132.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 6, 1922

WITH reference to my despatch No. 33 of the 10th ultimo, in which I forwarded a résumé of a report which I had received from the Armenian Patriarchate relative to the situation of the Armenian population in Cilicia, I have the honour to transmit herewith, for your Lordship's information, two extracts from a further report received through the Armenian Patriarchate from Beirut, dated the 1st February 1922, containing additional details of the exodus of the Christian population from Cilicia.

I have, &c

HORACE RUMBOLD

High Commissioner

Enclosure in No. 33

Extracts from Report sent through Armenian Patriarchate, Beirut

Tous les Arméniens d'Adana, de Tarsous, de Deir-Yol et de Djebeli-Bereket ont émigré. A peine une soixantaine ne restent encore à Adana et peut-être une vingtaine à Mersine, tandis qu'à Deir-Yol et à Djebeli-Bereket on ne trouve pas un seul

A Killis et à Atutah, l'exode continue lentement autant que les moyens disponibles le permettent. L'élément fortuné a déjà quitté cette dernière ville, où environ 5,000 Arméniens restent encore, n'ayant pas les ressources nécessaires pour s'expatrier et les autorités françaises n'ayant pris aucune disposition pour cette région. Mais c'est bien malgré eux qu'ils y restent.

Le transport en Syrie des réfugiés arméniens rassemblés à Mersine s'est effectuée par les soins d'une compagnie de navigation française, moyennant finances. Le prix du passage de Mersine à Beyrouth était de 505 piastres par personne et les bateaux étaient bondés. Arrivés en Syrie, les réfugiés étaient obligés de voir eux-mêmes comment ils pourraient se procurer leurs subsistances, car les autorités françaises ne semblent rien vouloir faire pour ce rapport. Il n'est même fait aucune réduction aux réfugiés qui veulent se rendre en chemin de fer à Damas. Seulement quelques trains spéciaux furent formés que les émigrés purent utiliser en payant leurs places. Les

bagages étaient transportés gratuitement, car les voyageurs payaient le prix de la troisième classe et prenaient le fourgon.

Les fournitures par des voyageurs arrivés à Beyrouth, sur la situation actuelle d'Anatolie.

Les autorités kemalistes ont fait bien piètre figure à leur arrivée à Adana, car elles manquent d'argent et d'organisation. La situation générale dans la ville même est bien triste. Ce sont des Français qui ont fourni jusqu'à l'uniforme aux soldats et gendarmes qui devaient faire leur entrée triomphale dans la cité, mais les indigènes, craignant de la classe et ne se laissant pas entraîner.

Environ 300 gendarmes et un bataillon de soldats seulement ont été envoyés à Adana. Tous les fonctionnaires ont été remplacés, même les huissiers et les concierges.

D'autre part, la situation économique y est déplorable et entièrement bouleversée. Elle est remplie d'événements turcs et kurdes qui menacent dans les rues toute la ville. Il n'y a pas un seul artisan, ni un seul commerçant. On pense généralement que tout est perdu. C'est évident. Le Gouverneur d'Anatolie, qui se trouve actuellement à Beyrouth le 5 janvier 1920.

B 1671 247 44

No. 34

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received February 14)

(No. 146) Secret.

My Lord.

I HAVE had the honour recently to receive several despatches from your Excellency, namely No. 1301 of the 28th November, No. 1306 of the 10th December, and No. 1307 of the 1st January in regard to American

and I am precisely how much truth there is in

Many of these reports are undoubtedly exaggerated and refer to schemes which may even exist

intention of the United States to extend their markets in the Near East, with particular regard to valuable oil fields which are known to exist in the eastern provinces of Anatolia, the Caucasus and Persia. In this respect American activities are undoubtedly an important part, of the general American oil work.

It is perhaps worthy of note that the two principal questions in regard to which the Allied High Commissioners have come into conflict with their American colleague concern the affairs of the Standard Oil Company, namely, the consumption of oil and the storage of inflammable liquids. To such an extent is this the case that it would be scarcely unreasonable to draw the conclusion that American policy here is largely dictated by the interests of oil in general and of that company in particular.

However, while there is no question as to the determination of Americans to secure as large a share as they can of both trade and oil in the Near East, I am, generally speaking, under the impression that, while much is contemplated, little definite has as yet been accomplished. The situation in Anatolia is still too uncertain and the vagaries of the signature to concessions still too insecure to permit of definite action.

It is for money and especially American money, as I have mentioned in your Lordship's despatch No. 301 the Government of the Grand National Assembly should, in its financial difficulties, be anxious to raise a loan in America in return for the mining and other concessions which are their only *quid pro quo*. But for the

it yet seems an opportune moment for a Turkish commission to visit America.

I have been unable so far to confirm the report mentioned in your Lordship's

despatch No. 1356 as to the efforts of the Standard Oil Company to acquire a seat on the board of the Anatolian Railway Company. There are, nevertheless, so many wheels within wheels in a complicated negotiation of this nature that it is quite possible that such an attempt is being made.

Your Lordship will doubtless have received through the N.I.S. copies of various reports on American commercial activities in this part of the world which have been drawn up by their representative in Constantinople. I would refer you in this

commercial secretary to this high

There has been much talk of Mr. Gillespie, the commercial

Anatolia for American trade, is probably more correct.

American stocks accumulated here some time ago in a mistaken anticipation of resumption of trade in South Russia.

It would seem, from the nature of a general survey. That object is in itself of no great importance, indeed a necessary preliminary to more definite action. If his report be of a nature, American groups and financiers will be encouraged to go a step further than they have hitherto done. It is certain that they are merely waiting for the suitable moment to do so.

I am replying to your Lordship's despatch No. 88, Secret, of the 23rd January last in a separate despatch.

I have, &c.
HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner.

Enclosure in No. 31

Memorandum

THE American High Commissioner informed Sir Horace Rumbold that his commercial attaché, Mr. Gillespie, had left Constantinople for Angora during the third week in December, ostensibly for the purpose of studying commercial conditions in the interior of Anatolia.

Mr. Gillespie went by the Ineboli Castamouni route and is returning by way of Mesopotamia. He is expected to return to Constantinople by the 20th February. During his absence various articles have appeared in local newspapers in this connection.

The "Tefid-i-Efkar" states that he has applied on behalf of an American capitalist group for powers to complete the construction of the Angora-Erzurum and the Angora-Sivas Railways and for constructional rights of the harbour of Samson. It is stated that the group is composed of American capitalists. Further, an application has been made for the organisation of a motor-lorry service and for the construction of bonded warehouses in various parts of the country. After Mr. Gillespie's return certain Americans acting for the capitalists will visit Angora for more detailed discussions, and the agreements will be drafted by them.

The "Yeni Gun" states that Mr. Gillespie's visit to Angora is partly for the purpose of obtaining concessions and also to convince himself as to whether or not

The "Yeni Dunya" states that representatives of three powerful American syndicates are making overtures at Algiers for the purpose of obtaining the rights for They have proposed to the Government

current year in connection with the project, and as far back as April the defendant set up a scheme by which he planned to construct a railway between the factory

Mr. Colbath to whom reference was made in a despatch No. 1264, dated the 10th December from the British Ambassador in Washington, arrived in Constantinople some weeks ago and has presumably been engaged since that time in Mr. Colbath's preliminary negotiations.

The "Yak" states that he informed their representative that he intended shortly to go to Angora and that his group propose to place in Anatolia a capital of from 50 to 100 million dollars in return for concessions of railways, mines and land. Later he proposes to establish sugar factories. It is intended that the Turkish people should subscribe 25 per cent. of the capital if they so desire, otherwise the full amount will be subscribed by the American group. Practically the entire capital is American, a small portion only being Canadian. In the event of successful negotiations, work commences in the spring of 1922. Mr. McDowell left for Angora during the first week of February.

Apart from commercial hunting on behalf of the American Government, in his own opinion, Mr. C. Hughes is undoubtedly engaged, he is also trying to unload the large quantity of goods that Mr. Mason Day, managing director of the American Foreign Investment in Russia, which owing to the blockade he has been unable to get rid of. In this connection it is to note that Mr. Mason Day is the president of the Barnhill Corporation, a newly formed subsidiary company of the well known Barnhill & Co. of New York. The American Government is also for the purpose of obtaining oil and

It was said in S. I. S. Report H. C. 2558 that Mr. Price, the president of the American Chamber of Commerce, was recently sent to Angola as a result of a twofold of the Standard Oil Company. It appears that this report is only erroneous. Mr. Price has no connection whatsoever with the American Chamber of Commerce. He is a free-lance to travel in search of ooze, and has recently returned.

1. Mr. [redacted] mentioned in the above report is probably Mr. John Miller, who received a passport to proceed to Belgium some weeks ago.

No 35

Lord Hurdage to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston — (Received February 14)

4 No. 342
My Lord

Paris February 12, 1922

I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith a copy of a letter which I have received from the President of the Council, Minister for Foreign Affairs, in reply to that which I addressed to his Excellency on the 2nd February, in accordance with the instructions contained in your Lordship's telegram No. 3.

1 February. A copy of my note was forwarded to your Lordship in my despatch
N 100 of the 2nd February.

Your Lordship will observe from M. Poincaré's note that the French Government do not consider that the secretaries' notes reporting the proceedings of the meeting of the Supreme Council at San Remo on the 24th April, 1920, have an official character and that they hold that the decisions of the San Remo meeting deal with Palestine alone, and that they can only come into force when the Sévres Treaty, or another treaty taking its place, has been duly ratified.

I venture further specially to draw your Lordship's attention to the last paragraph of the note of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, in which the French Government definitely claims the right to protect Catholic interests in the Ottoman Empire. This claim appears to conflict with the statement which, according to the *procès-verbal* of the San Remo meeting of the 24th April, 1920, was made by Eugene Nitti and agreed to by M. Millerand, and which laid down that "there will no longer be any question of the protection of the Catholics in the East by one nation or another."

I have, for

HARDINGE OF PENSHURST

Enclosure in No 35

M. Poincaré to Lord Hardinge

Ministère des Affaires Étrangères.
Paris le 11 février 1922

M-1 Ambassador.

J'ai l'honneur d'acuser réception de la lettre que votre Excellence a bien voulu m'adresser, le 2 février, touchant les incidents qui se sont produits à Constantinople à l'égard de nos 600 Israélites. Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute et respectueuse considération.

Je souhaiterais vivement de pouvoir donner au Haut-Commissaire de la République des instructions conformes aux vœux du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique.

Mais, à mon très grand regret, et
répond, ni à San Remo, ni ailleurs, aux des
aux dans l'ensemble des

Il est bien entendu que ces documents n'ont pas la valeur de procès-verbaux officiels.

s'appliquent à la Palestine seule, comme le protocole de 1843 s'appliquait à la Grèce seule, et non aux territoires qui, comme Constantinople, n'ont pas cessé d'appartenir à l'Empire ottoman.

J'y m'empresse d'ajouter que, même en ce qui concerne la Palestine, la renonciation de la France au protectorat des catholiques ne saurait avoir pour effet que l'abolition des privilèges d'ordre temporel, civil et politique, c'est-à-dire du droit de défendre les

Il n'appartenait pas au Gouvernement français de faire supprimer les honneurs

autorités ecclésiastiques compétentes. C'est pourquoi le Président du Conseil français a pu faire admettre par la conférence que le Vatican n'était pas parti dans la question alors débattue.

Si l'état agit à ce point, il est évident que les autres États de la région ne peuvent pas rester en arrière.

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{x}} \right) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial L}{\partial t}$$

M. Millerand a pu accorder à M. Nitti "qu'il n'y aura lieu à aucune réclamation contre les religieux qui ne voudront pas rendre les honneurs à la nation qui les réclame."

Alors, il ne pouvait pas dire, que la France doit renoncer à ces honneurs
par ordre du Saint-Siège.

Enfin, votre Excellence voudra bien reconnaître que les décisions du San-Remo, lors du Traité de Sèvres, ne sauraient avoir leur efficacité qu'au jour où ce traité, ou tout autre analogue, sera mis en vigueur. Aussi, le Gouvernement français serait-il

[8975]

fondé à demander jusqu'à nouvel ordre le maintien du *statu quo*, même en Palestine, si l'autorité n'y était dès à présent exercée par le Gouvernement britannique.

A plus forte raison ne saurait-il abandonner à Constantinople l'exercice d'aucun des droits que lui confèrent des traités internationaux dont l'effet n'est pas d'être

Le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique reconnaît
1. que de cette thèse, et ne contestera pas au Haut Commissaire de la Reine à Constantinople le droit non seulement de réclamer ses prérogatives traditionnelles dans les cérémonies liturgiques du culte catholique, mais encore de s'acquitter de tous les devoirs qui incombent au représentant de la Puissance protectrice des intérêts catholiques dans l'Empire ottoman

Veuillez agréer, &c
H. POINCARÉ.

E 1736 5 44]

No. 36

The Marquis Curzon of Kedleston to Sir H. Graham (Rome)

(No. 128.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, February 14

THE Italian Ambassador, in the course of a conversation with me this morning made a number of observations on different aspects of the projected Near Eastern Conference at Paris, the terms which it is not necessary to relate here, but which left on my mind the general impression that Paris is doing what it can to disturb the close understanding that has recently grown up between the Italian Government and ourselves, and to win Italy over to the French side. I took the opportunity of making a statement to his Excellency which it seems of greater importance to place on record.

I reminded him that ever since the Marquis della Torretta had assumed office I had pursued a policy of absolute candour and sincerity with him, assuming throughout that our interests and objects in the East were identical, that our point of view was on the whole the same, and that we were going to Paris with a single-hearted desire to bring the French into line with us in order to arrive at a common solution. As regards the Tripartite Agreement, arising out of the Tripartite Agreement, I had always assumed that our local assistance in enabling her to obtain the land secured for her, even after the war, to secure them in the same way as on the Angora Convention. I had assumed that Britain was bound to support the Italian Government in this matter, and that the Italian Government would support the British Government in this matter. I had assumed that the Italian Government would support the British Government in this matter, and that the British Government would support the Italian Government in this matter.

This statement on my morning I had received a telegram yesterday with the Marquis della Torretta's expression of my views with regard to the Italian financial proposals in Turkey, which would depend on what they were. The Marquis della Torretta had added that much pressure was being brought to bear on him from Paris to take the French side in the forthcoming discussion, and that if His Majesty's Government felt able to accept the Italian proposals and support them, we could count on his whole-hearted support, but otherwise we could not be assured of it.

Thus, I said to Signor de Martino, was an attitude on the part of his Government which seemed to me quite unworthy and to indicate a spirit which was not at all hopeful for the success of our discussions. I had hitherto believed that the Italian Government, like ourselves, were going into the conference, not with the idea of individual advantage from it or of holding a pistol at each other's head if we failed, but of bringing about a cessation of the warfare and a return of peace. I for my part could not approach the conference in any other spirit, and must decline to yield to any pressure of the sort to which I had referred.

His Excellency agreed cordially with me in admitting the impropriety of the

attitude reported in the telegram from you, if it correctly represented what the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs had said, and I feel sure that he will convey to his chief the reproach which my protest involved.

I am, &c

CURZON OF KEDLESTON

E 1866 5 44]

No. 37

Memorandum by Mr. Ryan. (Received February 18.)

SINCE my arrival in London I have been struck by the fluidity of official opinion as to the course which His Majesty's Government should take in the next phase of the Turkish question.

Four main lines of thought appear to prevail, namely:—

- That there is nothing for it but to go in with the Greeks again, so far as this can be done without giving them Government money and without putting troops into Anatolia.
- That there is nothing for it but to let the Turks and Greeks fight another round without any departure from Allied neutrality as it operates at present.
- That a settlement in the Near East is contingent on a settlement with Russia, and that, therefore, no progress can be made until the Russian Conference.
- That we should do what we can for the Turks, and what we can for the Greeks, and the Danubians if possible; to do what little we can for the minorities; and to make the best composition we can on questions like financial and economic control and safeguards for Allied interests in Turkey.

In attempting to define these lines of thought, I have doubtless wanted them too much. It is obvious that some of them in reality merge in each other. It is also shabbily an exaggeration to suggest that anyone now seriously advocates recourse to a) without some preliminary attempt to ensure the pacification of the Near East by other means. The four currents of opinion are nevertheless sufficiently definite and distinct to make it worth while to say how they differ.

We are now in a position to see that His Majesty's Government are not at all clear as to what they want to do. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is divided into two camps. One camp is in favour of a policy of non-interference, and the other camp is in favour of a policy of active intervention. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is divided into two camps. One camp is in favour of a policy of non-interference, and the other camp is in favour of a policy of active intervention. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is divided into two camps. One camp is in favour of a policy of non-interference, and the other camp is in favour of a policy of active intervention.

If the Greeks succeeded to the fullest extent, we should have to reckon with the hostility of the active elements in such remnant of Turkey as might remain, and with the hostility of a large part of the Islamic world, including the parts which concern us. If the Greeks failed, we could not refuse the Greeks territorial compensation for their fresh efforts undertaken under our auspices.

If on the other hand, the Greeks failed, we should have to reckon with a Turkey arrogant in her enhanced prestige, and the hostility of Moslems elsewhere would be the more dangerous for seeing in this rehabilitated Turkey a centre round which to rally and from which to derive inspiration.

(b) This is an admission of present Allied bankruptcy so far as the Near East is concerned. It is a recognition of the fact that the war has been so long and so bloody that both sides are exhausted and so war weary as to make them more amenable next winter to Allied persuasion than they now are.

The validity of this argument depends on the assumption that a new campaign

will not materially alter the balance between the two contestants. I myself do not foresee a radical alteration unless the Greeks themselves should decide to evacuate Asia Minor. What I do think probable is a sufficient alteration in favour of the Kemalists to increase their arrogance. If they can keep up the supply of war material, neither financial strain nor war-weariness will suffice to make them amenable, even should the Allies be more united eight months hence than they are at present. The selfishness of the Anatolian peasant is too great for war-weariness among the people to operate effectively. The leaders, who have been playing a winning game, are not particularly war-weary. There are indications of division among them, but they are absolutely united in their determination to keep the Greeks out of Anatolia, if not out of Eastern Thrace.

In the less likely event of the balance being altered in favour of the Greeks, they would be less disposed than they now are to relinquish Smyrna and part of Thrace but they would still be a long way from having reduced the Kemalists to impotence.

In either alternative the Allies would almost certainly be in a worse position than now to impose an equitable settlement.

(c.) I cannot express any confident opinion as to the probability of Soviet Russia going so much into the Allied orbit as to be willing to throw Angora overboard. Recent indications from Angora point to a rapprochement between Mustafa Kemal and Moscow. The alliance, though in some ways paradoxical, is a natural one so long as both are violently revolutionary and fundamentally antagonistic to the Allies. I am sure that the near future will strike the roots of this fundamental antagonism in their own soil. I doubt their readiness to cast it off.

I quite agree that the immediate purposes we can use Russia to bring about a settlement in Turkey. We may perhaps hope, as a result of Genoa, to make Russia neutral in her attitude towards Angora, but this will leave the Turkish national movement still in being, and with sufficient life in it to give us trouble for a long time to come.

Assuming, however, for the sake of argument, that we may hope to get more from Russia at Genoa, i.e., to secure active Russian co-operation in bringing about a settlement in the Near East, it is necessary to consider the terms which we are prepared to offer to Russia as the price of her co-operation. Are we prepared to go back to the 1913 policy of allowing her to take Constantinople and to acquire a chunk of territory in North-Eastern Asia Minor? Or are we prepared to offer her the conditions of a weak vassal State, though without any immediate breach in its territorial integrity? Or, is it expected that the advantages to be gained by Russia at Genoa in the wider sphere, i.e., de jure recognition and reinstatement in the European economic system, will suffice without any specific advantage in the Near East itself?

Moreover, it is now pretty clear that the Genoa Conference cannot take place before April. In the meantime, Mustafa Kemal remains in control at Angora and if the Greeks maintain their army in Asia Minor.

(d.) The above considerations lead me to the conclusion that present action on the part of the Allies is desirable, and that this alternative affords the only basis of such action. In my memorandum of the 7th February I outlined a procedure by which effect might be given to it without showing undue weakness vis-à-vis of Angora.

It is not a question of devising ultimate means of coercion if the opponents of a reasonable settlement are not to be brought to terms. I am sure that the Allies will be able to do this. Nevertheless, I consider that the effort should be made.

The proposed procedure would not compromise any real French interest, except in so far as it would commit the French to participation in ultimate measures of coercion. They have involved themselves with the Kemalists, but the proposed procedure gives their friends the Kemalists an opportunity to come into line. If the Kemalists do not come into line except on the basis of the full National Pact, French interests in Turkey will be threatened hardly less than ours. What we have to contend with in the case of the French is not that the proposed procedure would compromise their real interests, but that it would excite their suspicion and jealousy.

I need not deal at length with the other difficulties. That of devising ultimate means of coercion must be faced. Unless we are prepared to resort to coercion at long last, we cannot influence the course of events at all and we may as well make up our minds to the necessity of swallowing the National Pact sooner or later, except in so far as the Greeks may be able to modify it on their own account in respect of Thrace. The difficulty of getting the Greeks to hold on provisionally in Asia Minor, in one which it should be possible to get over by appealing to their own interests and the interest of the Greek population of Asia Minor. The removal of the latter concurrently with the evacuation of the Greek army seems to me to be a practical impossibility.

If the proposed procedure should fail utterly, as it might, we should be no worse off in respect of the other alternatives than we now are.

In conclusion, I would lay stress on the danger of complications in Mesopotamia this spring and summer if no settlement is arrived at. I do not wish to exaggerate this danger, but the recovery of part of Mesopotamia is an integral part of the National Pact, and there is always, to my mind, a risk of the Kemalists making an effort in that direction, possibly in conjunction with Bolshevik activity in Persia. It is true that the engagements of the Kemalists elsewhere would make it difficult for them to divert any considerable force to the northern frontier of Mesopotamia, but they might hope to achieve a good deal by a comparatively small military effort, assisted by intrigue in Kurdistan and in Mesopotamia itself.

A B

February 17, 1922

E 1927/5 44)

No 35

Mr. Lindley to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston - (Received February 20.)

(No 82)

My Lord,

Athens, February 11, 1922.

I HAVE the honour to report that the Greek press of the last few days has been full of eulogistic articles on your Lordship's recent speech in the House of Lords on the Eastern question. The speech is taken as recognising the past services of Greece to the Allies, and that if the Allies do not do justice to these services, they would be unjustly rewarded by desertion in her hour of need.

In the meantime, partial reports of the conversations between Mr Lloyd George and the Patriarch Meletios, mentioned in my despatch No. 45, Confidential, of the 28th ultimo, have gradually leaked into the press and caused a good deal of comment. The Prime Minister's supposed utterances have been interpreted as definitely anti-Greek, and your Lordship's speech has, in consequence, been doubly welcome. The verities of the conversations which have been published do not, however, reproduce the most striking expressions contained in the letter mentioned in my above-mentioned despatch.

It is somewhat remarkable that the press, as a whole, continues to speak of the evacuation of Asia Minor as impossible, although the Greek Government would, as far as I can judge, be only too glad to withdraw their troops forthwith if the Christian population were only safeguarded.

I have, &c.

F O LINDLEY

E 1907/5 44)

No 36

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. - (Received February 20.)

(No. 161)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 14, 1922

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith a statement giving twenty-five points, which I have collected from the press, in regard to the settlement of the Near Eastern question. This statement was submitted some days ago to the Inter-Allied press censorship by the "Bosphore," a local newspaper published in French and although passed by the censorship has not yet been published. I have caused enquiries to be made of the "Bosphore" as to the source of the statement, and am informed that it was obtained from certain officials of the Constantinople Government who are in sympathy with the Nationalist movement.

2. Point No. 1, which speaks of the administrative autonomy of Eastern and Western Thrace with the line Enos-Midia, would appear to be due to a confusion, and is probably an error. In other statements of their claims, which have come to my knowledge, the Kemalists demand that Eastern Thrace, including Adrianople and the northern coast of the Marmara should be restored to Turkish sovereignty without restrictions of any kind.

I have, &c
HORACE RUMBOLD

Enclosure in No. 39

Les Revendications turques.

1. La commission chargée à Angora des préparatifs de paix a terminé ses travaux et remis son rapport qui a été rendu public.

Yusuf Kemal Bey, Commissaire des Affaires étrangères, qui se rend en Europe, se propose de défendre les revendications turques suivantes :

1. Autonomie administrative de la Thrace orientale et occidentale avec la ligne d'Enos-Midia.

2. Les Dardanelles sans occupation militaire.

3. L'intervention étrangère et *status quo ante bellum* dans la question de Constantinople, dont le régime et la situation sont considérés comme des questions d'ordre intérieur.

4. Paiement par les Hellènes des dépenses occasionnées pour la restauration des territoires occupés, ainsi que des indemnités de déplacement des "muhadjirs."

5. Restitution sans condition à la souveraineté turque de toutes les localités de l'Asie Mineure conformément au pacte national.

6. Aucune intervention étrangère dans la question des Dardanelles. Solution de cette question entre les intéressés considérés comme parties belligères et d'une façon qui donne à tous satisfaction.

7. En ce qui concerne les frontières orientales, les clauses spécifiées dans les traités conclus entre le Gouvernement d'Angora et de Mossoul sont maintenues.

8. Octroi à la Turquie de l'indépendance absolue politique, militaire, financière et économique.

9. Suppression des Capitulations.

10. Octroi aux minorités des privilèges et garanties accordés par les Traités de Saint-Germain, de Neuilly, dans les limites du pacte national.

11. Reconnaissance par les Puissances étrangères de tous les traités et accords conclus jusqu'ici par le Gouvernement d'Angora avec les grands et petits Etats.

12. Autorisation de l'introduction de capitains étrangers dans toute la Turquie pour en faire bénéficier les affaires commerciales, économiques, les travaux publics sous tous les rapports.

13. Existence d'une armée turque capable de sauvegarder la tranquillité en Turquie et de défendre son territoire contre toute agression étrangère.

14. Liberté du Gouvernement d'Angora dans toutes ses affaires intérieures.

15. Admission au plus tôt de la Turquie à la Société des Nations.

16. Organisation d'une flotte turque en mesure de défendre la Turquie.

17. Reconnaissance des dettes turques dues aux Alliés sur la base de la répartition des territoires partagés. Dettes dues aux anciens Alliés considérées comme nulles et non payées.

18. Les paiements effectués pour la plupart des commandes militaires (telles que les dreadnoughts "Sultan Osman" et "Réchadié") faites avant la guerre à diverses sociétés seront déduites du montant des dettes turques.

19. Le Gouvernement d'Angora sera autorisé à établir des relations politiques et commerciales avec tous les Etats.

20. Les Kemalistes ne feront pas de propagande dans les pays étrangers contre aucun Etat.

21. Les Kemalistes n'interviendront dans l'organisation civile et militaire d'aucun Etat et ne l'assisteront pas non plus.

22. Renonciation de tous les droits de la Turquie sur la Mésopotamie, la Syrie, la Palestine, l'Arabie et la région avoisinante et établissement de bonnes relations avec les Gouvernements de ces pays.

23. Dès la conclusion du Traité de Paix, échange des prisonniers dans le plus bref délai.

24. Exécution intégrale du traité à conclure et sauvegarde des biens meubles et immeubles des minorités en cas d'exode.

25. Acceptation du contrôle provisoire pour toute l'Anatolie à l'instar de celui exercé en Cilicie afin de surveiller l'exécution du traité et empêcher tout malentendu.

Le Gouvernement d'Angora n'acceptera pas la plus légère modification des vingt-cinq clauses ci-dessus considérées comme les revendications minima de la Turquie.

Au cas où le conflit turco-grec ne serait pas résolu sur ces bases, les opérations militaires recommenceraient en Asie Mineure.

E 1908 769 44]

No. 40

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received February 20.)

(No. 164)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 14, 1922.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship copy of a memorandum prepared by Mr. Knox, second secretary at this High Commission, on the subject of a recent journey in Eastern and Western Thrace.

I have, &c

HORACE RUMBOLD

High Commissioner

Enclosure in No. 41

Memorandum.

THE following impressions, brought back from a brief shoot in the Maritima, may perhaps be of some interest.

Maritime law is strictly applied, though from Chetumal to Xanthi all stations are under the same jurisdiction.

The Maritima is a very fertile and beautiful country, but the land is in the hands of a few large landowners, and the peasants are very poor.

The Maritima is a very fertile and beautiful country, but the land is in the hands of a few large landowners, and the peasants are very poor.

These disputed areas, in that, being indispensable for the country's great wealth, it has not been, nor is likely to be, displaced by the hands of ownership of its territory.

At the same time it appears to suffer considerably at the hands of the Government. We were told by our host, the American manager of a tobacco company with a long and intimate experience of the Near East, that he had seen in Samouni Butra in the early part of the war the Turkish treatment of the Christian minorities, during two of Government by the Bulgarians at Xanthi he saw their handling of both Turks and Greeks, he was now witnessing the measure meted out by Greeks to the Turkish population. He was of opinion that there was not a whit to choose between these administrations, and, while sympathising warmly with the peasants, expressed for the sake of all three races a refreshingly impartial disgust. He quoted to us a very striking instance in which, on the ground of an attack on the railway by persons unknown, the whole population of a Turkish village was separated into groups of men and women and driven by Greek troops into the mountains in mid winter.

The direct taxation bears very heavily on the cultivator, who pays a 12 per cent tax on his crop and also a heavy percentage of his earnings when working in the off-season.

Xanthi and its neighbourhood presents an appearance of complete neglect. The Maritima, which was of great value to the country, has lain unrepared for two years, and is now impassable.

The Maritima valley in the region of Saffi, where there appears to be a pronounced Greek or at least Christian majority, appears neat and prosperous with well-tilled fields and a large silk industry.

At Kulo Burgaz, where we spent three days, one came into the same unpopulated desolation that marks the course of the railway through Eastern Thrace. There is an abundance here of rich well-watered land, which has clearly lain fallow for two or three years. The population consists of various origin, who exist miserably and appear to exhaust their efforts in repairing destroyed hovels. The Greek soldiers complain much of their unfriendliness.

The Greek military commandant with whom we stayed was a good specimen of the Greek officer. He was promoted from the ranks, a peasant of the Peloponnese, knowing no language but his own. Whist full of patriotism, he nevertheless showed much of the fatigue of ten years' military service without leave. He inveighed bitterly both against the French and the politicians of his own country. He could, as a peasant, see much of the potential wealth of Thrace, but appeared at the same time to realise that this could not be exploited by Greece without a capital which she does not possess.

We were everywhere received with an almost embarrassing cordiality by the Greek authorities.

In general, the journey merely revived the conviction I had reached some years ago in Eastern Macedonia that nothing can be made of these undoubtedly rich territories so long as they remain under the rule of any of the "limnrophe" States—a rule which is inevitably a brutal and costly military tyranny over a fluctuating and perpetual refugee—on which the precarious tenure both of the State and of the individual is no useful effort. An international régime strong enough to enforce its frontiers and to assure to the population the fruits of its labours appears, sooner or later, to be the inevitable solution.

Constantinople, February 11, 1922

X 1651/336/500

No. 41

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston — (Received February 21)

(No. 171)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 14, 1922

I HAVE the honour to report that on the morning of Saturday, the 11th February, the secretaries' house at Therapia was destroyed by fire.

2. Information was received here at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, and immediately afterwards the British naval authorities reported by telephone that matters had gone so far as to make it impossible to save the building.

3. A member of my staff at once started for Therapia, but did not reach the Embassy grounds until after half past 4, as the deep snow made it necessary to proceed on foot for a considerable portion of the journey.

4. On arrival he found the house burned down to the ground.

5. So far as could be ascertained at the time, the fire began in the room occupied by the secretaries at about 10 o'clock, at a time when he was in the garden. The fire brigade arrived an hour or two later.

6. A considerable part of the furniture in the house was saved. There was no loss of life.

7. A full report on the matter will, I presume, be sent to the Office of Works by their representative here, but in this connection I have the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship a copy of a report on the subject addressed by the officer commanding Bosphorus patrol to the British captain of the port.

8. I am expressing to the Russian diplomatic representative and to my French colleague my thanks for the assistance rendered by their nationals.

I have &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD

High Commissioner.

Enclosure in No. 41.

Officer Commanding Bosphorus Patrol to British Captain of the Port, Constantinople

Sir,

Buyukdere, February 11, 1922

I HAVE the honour to report that, whilst on duty at Buyukdere at about 5 p.m. to-day, I observed flames rising from a house at Therapia. A strong north east wind was prevailing at the time, with heavy snow and sleet falling, but as best as I could I proceeded to the scene.

Embassy chapel. I immediately gathered together the Russian volunteer fire brigade (under the command of Lieutenant de la Garde Guillemin) with their fire-engine and equipment, and proceeded towards Therapia in motor launches 15 and 17, at the same time asking officer commanding 3rd Hussars detachment, Buyukdere, to send mounted patrol by land in order to keep order and prevent looting, &c.; also informed Ocean Salvage Company's tug "La Vallette," which was anchored in the bay.

Owing to the rough sea breaking over the sea wall abreast of the house, the fire brigade had to be landed at Therapia ferry landing pier, much valuable time being inadvertently lost thereby, as the engine had to be dragged over a shivery road covered with snow.

that the fire was burning fiercely, and that the top floor had entirely disappeared.

I was with the Russian volunteer fire brigade in order to get to a favourable position to windward to deal more effectively with the situation.

All efforts to keep the fire under unfortunately proved unavailing, and at about 7 p.m. the burning debris went into the sea. At this stage it was

the fire from spreading. There was no loss of life.

From enquiries I instituted, the guardian of the house stated that the fire originated through the upsetting of an oil stove in one of the top storey rooms.

I should like to bring to favourable notice the gallant attempt made by the Russian volunteer fire brigade to extinguish the fire, at great personal risk to their lives. This brigade comes under the direct orders of the General Kirof, the commandant of the Russian Embassy at Buyukdere.

Five French sailors from the French Embassy at Therapia also rendered valuable assistance.

I have, &c.

CLAUDE L. WOOLLARD,

Lieutenant, R.N.

E 1929 900 44

No. 42

Count de Salis to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston — (Received February 20)

(No. 21)

My Lord,

Palazzo Borghese,

Rome, February 14, 1922

WITH reference to your Lordship's telegram No. 9 of the 13th February, I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of the note addressed to the Cardinal Secretary of State in pursuance of the instructions conveyed to me.

I took the opportunity of saying a few words to the cardinal a couple of days ago, and he at once replied by repeating what I have already reported to your Lordship as his views, that the protectorate was based on the Capitulations, that there where the Turks had gone the Capitulations, and with them the protectorate, had also ceased. The idea of a protectorate, once a civilised Government was established, was an absurdity.

While answering, I pointed out to his Eminence that on previous occasions I had had to speak to him about Palestine, but at present we were not talking about a country which the Turks had had to leave but about Constantinople, we maintained that the protectorate there had also ceased in virtue of the agreement of San Remo.

The cardinal then repeated what I reported to your Lordship at the time — how

[8975]

9

I told the cardinal that instructions had been sent to Paris in order definitely to clear up misunderstanding. The note which I was addressing to him would show clearly the view of His Majesty's Government, that France had abandoned her protectorate in the East and agreed with Great Britain and Italy that none of the three countries should exercise such special protection in future.

I have, &c.

J DE SALIS

Count de Salin to Cardinal Gasparri

Palazzo Strozzi.

Home, le 14 février 1922

Il est déjà appris qu'un requête adressée à été célébré à
repas de l'âme de Sa Sainteté Benoît XV. A cette occasion le
du Haut Commissaire français, se conformant aux instructions envoyées de
s'est fait accorder une place apostolique comme représentant de la France protectrice
des catholiques en Orient. Dans ces circonstances, et bien que très désireux d'assister à
l'œuvre de la Sainte Messe, M. de ... ne peut pas le faire
car de se rendre à l'invitation du délégué apostolique. Son attitude est pleinement
approuvée par Lord Curzon.

Lors de la réunion de San Remo, la France, à la date du 24 avril 1920, n'est pas parvenue à un accord avec l'Angleterre et l'Italie sur le point de savoir si les pays catholiques en Orient; il a été établi qu'aucun des trois pays ne exercera désormais un droit spécial de protectorat de cette nature. Je suis chargé par Lord Curzon de porter cet accord à la connaissance de votre Éminence en exprimant l'espoir que, par des instructions opportunes envoyées aux autorités de l'Église latine, on pourrait écarter le renouvellement de malentendus regrettables.

၂၀ ရာစုနှစ် နှစ်

DE SALES

No. 49.

V. *Commissio* to the Marquesas Surgeon of Redleston.—(Received February 20.)

My Lord,

ON the 27th October, 1921, your Lordship was present at the
M. R. ...
...
with long ...
...
...
Allied Powers ...
...
and once more manifested by your Lordship on the occasion of this interview, we
...
that it was in the interest of Greece to adhere to your Lordship's proposal. Various
circumstances, which your Lordship is more competent to appreciate than myself, have
hitherto deferred a solution of the problem, and more than three months have elapsed
w
your Lordship to that end

...rest foundation for the negotiation of peace with Turkey, in the common interest of the two countries, consisted in the maintenance of the military *status quo* in Anatolia. To this

The steady depletion of the financial resources of the country, moreover, unavoidably involved increasing difficulty in supplying the needs of the army, and daily increasing hardships for the troops in Asia Minor. In spite of these difficulties it has hitherto proved possible for Greece to meet the situation. Her exertions to this end have, however, created a state of things to which I feel it my duty to draw your Lordship's attention in the hope that the interest which we know the British Government to feel in the matter will impel them to accord it their careful attention with a view to facilitating the discovery of means to meet the present difficulties which must needs prove insuperable for Greece, if she is left to her own resources.

2. In particular I wish to bring to your Lordship's knowledge that the financial resources of the Greek Government are completely exhausted. In anticipation of this inevitable development I repeatedly approached the British Government with a view to their granting facilities for the conclusion of a loan in the British market.

the Chancellor of the Exchequer and myself, whereby the British Government signifies its consent to the conclusion of a loan not exceeding 15,000,000*l.*, and to the granting of security for such loan. In spite of this action of the British Government it has not yet proved possible to conclude the loan. Meanwhile, information from Athens represented the situation of the Treasury as growing steadily worse, and the latest telegrams state that the Government is completely unable to meet the expenditure on the upkeep of the army for the first half of February (o.s.), in spite of the fact that in the meanwhile disbursements of public money on any other object have practically ceased.

3 Over and above this complete financial *impasse*, it should be recalled that the campaigning season in Asia Minor is approaching. Little more than a month separates us from the date on which operations were resumed last year. Meanwhile the enemy has been reinforced in men and supplies. Not to mention the war-material which he has been able to procure from Soviet Russia, we cannot but note with painful surprise the attitude taken up in this connection by the Allied Powers by whose aid the Greek army participated in the war which Turkey had declared not against Greece but against the Allies. Certain of these Allied Powers have gone so far as to supply the enemy with arms and munitions to be used against their ally in the great war. Others, who themselves stopped short of such action, nevertheless, did nothing to put an end to the above flagrant violation of the armistice of October 1918 and of the Treaty of Sevres, both of which explicitly provide for the disarmament of Turkey. Finally, all the Allied Powers without exception have refused to recognise that a state of war still subsists as between them and Turkey as a necessary consequence of the non-conclusion of peace with the latter. Hence their declaration of neutrality in the Greco-Turkish conflict which, moreover, has been so interpreted as to deny Greece full enjoyment of the rights recognised by international law to belligerents in respect of neutrals.

Your Lordship will readily understand the gravity of the danger created for the Greek army by such reinforcement of the Turkish forces and by the approach of the campaigning-season in Anatolia. According to information which has just reached me from the Greek command in Asia Minor the moral of the troops remains unimpaired, but the enemy has a numerical superiority of some 10,000 men, is better supplied with cavalry and has twice as many aeroplanes as the Greek army, though, on the other hand, he is weaker in artillery, disposing of roughly 100 guns less than our own army. In this connection I cannot refrain from pointing out that this advantage of the Greek army would have been sensibly balanced had care been taken to execute the disarmament clauses of the armistice, or had the Greek force despatched to Asia Minor with a mandate of the Supreme Council, been allowed a free hand to act as military considerations clearly dictated.

Under these circumstances the Greek command in Asia Minor state that they cannot undertake to give an assurance of their ability to cope with the contingency of a Turkish offensive unless they receive (1) reinforcements sufficient to raise the units under them to full strength and thus neutralise the present Turkish superiority in number, (2) supplies of fresh war-material (especially aeroplanes, machine-guns affected, and (3) financial assistance as the present financial position of the army is desperate.

Unless these conditions are fulfilled, the command consider that the impending Turkish offensive will expose the army to very serious dangers, and urgently request that the above measures be instantly taken or, should they prove to be impracticable, that an order be instantly given to avoid the dangers foreseen through a withdrawal, while it is yet time to take the initiative of a withdrawal before being forced to it by the development of the situation. They consider, further, that such a withdrawal must necessarily amount to a complete evacuation of Asia Minor, since no line more to the west would afford, in the event of withdrawal from the fortified line now held, stronger defensive position which would enable the army to hold out without strengthening it by the measures above indicated.

Finally, the command of the Asia Minor army add that should the enemy receive yet further reinforcements it would become necessary similarly to reinforce our own army by calling up fresh classes to the colours, so as to neutralise the accession of strength to the enemy.

With regard to the above, the Greek Government is indeed in a position to meet the call for more troops in both of the cases contemplated. Clearly, however, the Greek Government is not in a position to furnish the Asia Minor army with the financial assistance of which it is in such need, or to supply the necessary war material, least of all in the event of the calling up of fresh classes, when considerable additional armament will be a necessity.

4. I need hardly point out to the British Government the consequences which must inevitably follow if Greece is left to her own inadequate resources. Fully conscious of the obligations assumed by all the Powers allied in the war against Turkey towards the Christian populations of Asia Minor, Greece, on the mandate of the Allied Powers, undertook to impose on Turkey the terms of peace on which the Allies had agreed in discharge of those obligations.

Throughout the consequent struggle, Greece scrupulously respected the limitations placed on her action by the Allies, even where these were a serious hindrance in the way of the discharge of her task, as in precluding for her the possibility of military action against the capital of the enemy. In this struggle Greece, inspired by her natural and legitimate interest in the fate of the Greek populations of Western Asia Minor, has put forth all her strength and exhausted all her resources. The effect of her

and at the same time has been able to offer a firm foundation for the conclusion of peace. Were the Greek army, owing to the reasons already stated, to be compelled to evacuate Asia Minor, a state of things would come into being which, I have every reason to hope, will be regarded by the British Government as incompatible with the generous interest which they feel in the fate of these Christian populations. The fate of these populations Greece will henceforth be obliged to leave in the hands of the Allied Powers, who, in their turn, will no longer have at their disposal in their peace

in Asia Minor. The British Government will readily understand that were the Greek army to be withdrawn from its present base covering the Christian populations of Western Asia Minor and the Straits, not only would the Christian populations be exposed to the horrors of a Kemalist invasion, but Turkish arrogance would henceforth stop at nothing and the Kemalist advance would halt neither at the Smyrna enclave nor at Smyrna, but would sweep up to the Straits.

However, alive to these consequences, Greece, if left to her unassisted resources, will nevertheless be obliged to bow to the inexorable necessity of leaving to the future the vindication of ethical rights formerly recognised by all the Allied Powers and to divert the military forces, inadequate for carrying through the campaign in Asia Minor, to the defence of the frontiers assigned to her in Europe by the Peace Conference.

5. The British Government, I am confident, will readily understand that I should have felt it to be my urgent duty to bring the foregoing to their knowledge. The situation on which I have dwelt cannot, I feel, but be a matter of concern to the

British Government. Further, the conception which I have of Anglo-Greek relations and which I have sought to manifest in my policy, makes me feel that I should be failing in my duty to my country at this critical juncture were I to omit fully and frankly to put the situation before the Power in whose friendship the Greek race has ever confidently relied, to the end that the British Government may be able to communicate to us their views in the light of this situation, and to consider the measures which it may suggest to them.

I have, &c
D. GOUNARIS.

E 1928 5 44]

No. 44

Sir R. Graham to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston — (Received February 20.)

No. 153.)

My Lord

Rome, February 17, 1922.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 69 of the 15th instant, and your Lordship's gram No. 50 of the 15th instant, I have duly noted the language held by you to the Italian Ambassador on the subject of the Italian suggestion that their support at

or His Majesty's Government to your Lordship's proposals to me.

Your Lordship is in the happy position of being able to declare with all truth and that His Majesty's Government are approaching the conference on the Near East by the desire to secure a prompt and lasting peace on just and

under the Tripartite Agreement as one of the few

worth. I believe that it can fairly be said that the Italian Government on the whole agree with the point of view of His Majesty's Government on the Near Eastern question and are inclined to support it upon its merits. But the divergence of opinion between Great Britain and France appears a heaven-sent opportunity for Italy, having herself no strong convictions, to sell her support to the highest bidder in return for whatever she can get. It is a constant theme in the press and a source of perpetual expression of dissatisfaction with the conduct of Italian foreign policy that such a unique chance is being missed. Hence the Marquis della Torretta's candid though cynical offer.

I scarcely imagine that your Lordship's reception of the Italian proposal will come as a great shock or surprise to his Excellency. M. de Martino is understood to be an adept at repeating your Lordship's language in a softened and attenuated form, but if the Marquis della Torretta returns to the subject with me, I will not fail to make the more than a few days longer, and it is probably with his successor that I shall have to deal. I do not think that this Italian attempt at a gentle form of blackmail need be taken too seriously, or that its failure will have much influence one way or the other upon the attitude of the Government unless some similar enterprise in Paris has produced more substantial results.

I have, &c
R. GRAHAM

Memorandum on the Russo-British Agreement of 1915 as to the future of Constantinople and the Straits

FOR nearly 200 years the control of the Straits and the annexation of Constantinople had been regarded by Russian national feeling as a great historical task of the Russian nation, to this all other objects would, if necessary, be subordinated or postponed. During the 19th century the chief obstacle had been the constant opposition of the British Government. The first immediate objective had since the Crimean war been the "opening of the Straits"; the acquisition of Constantinople was allowed to remain in the background. The arrangements of the *Entente* between Great Britain and Russia brought about a change in British policy which was also justified by our control of the Suez Canal and occupation of Egypt, and in 1908 Sir Edward Grey informed the Russian Government that His Majesty's Government agreed in principle to the opening of the Straits: he only asked that the definite settlement should be postponed to a convenient time.

2. As a result of the Balkan wars of 1912-13 and the defeat of Turkey, the question of Constantinople itself came into the foreground. The Russian Government were seriously alarmed lest they might be anticipated by the Bulgarians, and, as they explained at the time, if the Bulgarians occupied Constantinople, the Russian fleet would at once have been sent to the Bosphorus. Their apprehensions were increased by the control which the Germans were securing over Constantinople, and in the spring of 1914 all the arrangements were considered for despatching a joint military and naval force to occupy the city if occasion arose.

3. As soon as war broke out with Turkey at the beginning of November 1914, there was a general conviction that the time had now come to achieve the secular object of Russian ambitions. On the 12th November, Sir Edward Grey, in discussing the question whether the offensive should be taken against Turkey, or the war for the present be confined to defensive measures, added —

"But I should like Minister for Foreign Affairs to know that however much we or Russia may assume a defensive attitude in the war with Turkey, while the issue against Germany, on which all other issues depend, is pressed to a conclusion, we cannot afford to neglect the Turkish question. It is a question which, having made a complete settlement of the Turkish question, including that of the Straits, we must settle at once. It is a question which, if we do not settle it now, will, of course, be effected after Germany is defeated, whether or not Turkish rule is overthrown in the course of hostilities meanwhile."

In conversation with Count Benckendorf, he had made a verbal statement, which Count Benckendorf communicated to M. Sazonov in the following words —

"Si l'Allemagne est écrasée, le sort des Détroits et de Constantinople ne pourrait cette fois pas être décidé autrement que conformément à nos intérêts."

This statement was approved by Sir Edward Grey as correct.

4. On the 28th November, the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs, in an *aide-memoire*, stated that his Government would be prepared to recognise the annexation of Egypt to Great Britain "after the declarations made by Sir Edward Grey with reference to the ultimate fate of the Straits and Constantinople." At this stage, therefore, the Russian Government, understanding that it was the intention to annex Egypt, gave their assent on condition that their wishes with regard to the Straits and Constantinople were fulfilled. It was explained to them immediately afterwards that His Majesty's Government did not propose to annex Egypt, but only to declare a protectorate, but M. Sazonov said that the declaration he had given would hold good should His Majesty's Government annex Egypt later.

5. At this time His Majesty's Government did not know precisely what were the Russian proposals regarding the Straits and Constantinople. Information on this point is conveyed in a telegram from Sir George Buchanan of the 22nd November —

"From language held hitherto by Minister for Foreign Affairs in course of academic conversations, settlement which his Excellency eventually contemplates

...ion of Turks from Europe, complete freedom of Straits and acquisition by Russia of territory on both sides of Bosphorus, so as to enable her to guard entrance into Black Sea in war time, as he has more than once declared he could never allow Bulgaria to go beyond Ence-Midia line. I gather he will claim territory to east of that line for Russia. He has hitherto if Russia would be content with an arrangement under which Constantinople and a certain radius of territory would be neutralised or given status of a free port. Since Turks commenced hostilities, question of Constantinople and Straits has engrossed the attention of the Russian public to such a degree that I doubt whether they will in the end be prepared to renounce long cherished idea of incorporating Constantinople in Russian Empire."

6. After this nothing more is heard of the matter for some time. During the month of February it came up in a more urgent form owing to the proposed attack on the Dardanelles. It was at this time anticipated that within a very short period the Allied forces might actually be in occupation of Constantinople. The Russian Government clearly desired that before this happened they should receive a precise and formal agreement to their claims. Moreover, the British Government were using all their efforts to procure the military assistance of Greece and of Bulgaria. Thus, especially the former, aroused the strongest opposition at St. Petersburg. The Tsar himself had declared "in most positive terms that he could in no circumstances consent to any naval or military action by Greece in the neighbourhood of the Straits." They obviously feared that if a Greek force were once established there it would be very difficult to get rid of them. The Greek Government itself disclaimed any territorial ambitions in this district, but desired that Greek soldiers should take part in the recovery of St. Sofia to Christianity. For military reasons it was most important that the Russian veto should be withdrawn, but clearly this would not be done unless a binding declaration were made as to the future of Constantinople. On the 25th February, Sir Edward Grey, in answer to a question in the House of Commons, said that a statement "that the events on the Russo-Turkish frontier will bring Russia nearer to the realisation of the political and economic problems bound up with the question of Russian access to the sea, was an inspiration with which he was in entire sympathy." He evaded, however, the question about the future of Constantinople.

...realised would no doubt be settled in the terms of peace. This answer seems to have aroused apprehensions in Russia, and he was pressed to give a more definite and binding declaration.

7. On the 2nd March, Count Benckendorf presented a memorandum, in which he said that the study of the Russian demands was not completed, but at the moment could be summarised as follows —

In Europe the Ottoman power must come to an end, the line Ence-Midia would serve as frontier between Russia and Bulgaria. On the continent of Asia the course of the Sakaria might serve as a frontier line. Finally, the security of our position in the Straits will have to be guaranteed on the side of the southern shore of the Sea of Marmora. Russia will take into consideration the economic interests of Roumania, of Bulgaria and of the probable remnants of Turkey, as well as of the interests of European commerce.

8. On the 4th March, Sir Edward Grey telegraphed to Sir George Buchanan "that the British Government was prepared to accept the Russian demands for the Dardanelles solely for the common cause. His Majesty's Government had no objection to the Russian fleet being stationed in the Dardanelles, and to the Russian fleet being stationed in the Dardanelles solely for the common cause. He therefore pressed strongly against the Russian refusal to permit the Greeks to take any part in the occupation of Constantinople. As to the future of Constantinople and the Straits, he said —

"I have endorsed in public the formula of the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs, and have made no objection to anything he has said to you about it, though a formal and precise agreement must be reserved for discussion with France in accordance with the British-French-Russian Alliance of the 5th September, and can probably not be completed except in final terms of peace. We cannot permit the Greeks to take any part in the occupation of the Straits that will conflict with Russian interests. We had never contemplated

the annexation of any part of the Straits by Greece. The compensation contemplated for Greece out of Turkish territory is Smyrna."

At this time, then, Sir Edward Grey clearly hoped to avoid a more precise undertaking than that which he had already given.

9. On this very day, however, M. Sazonov presented to Sir George Buchanan an *aide memoire* (which has been published by the Bolsheviks) to the following effect:—

"Course of latest events leads His Majesty the Emperor Nicholas to think that the question of Constantinople and the Straits must be definitely solved in accordance with traditional aspirations of Russia.

"Any solution would be unsatisfactory and precarious if it did not incorporate henceforward in Russian Empire the city of Constantinople, western shore of the Bosphorus of the Sea of Marmora and of the Dardanelles, as well as Southern Thrace up to the Enos-Midia line.

"*Ipsu facto* and by strategic necessity, part of Asiatic shore included between the Bosphorus, River Sakharra and a point to be fixed on the Gulf of Imdid islands of the Sea of Marmora, Islands of Imbros and Tenedos, ought to be incorporated in the Empire.

"Special interests of France and of Great Britain in the region above described will be scrupulously respected.

"Imperial Government likes to hope that above considerations will meet with sympathy of the two Allied Governments. Said Governments are assured of meeting with, at the hands of Imperial Government, the same sympathy for realisation of desiderata which they may form in other regions of Ottoman Empire and elsewhere.

10. From Sir George Buchanan's telegram we learn that the French Ambassador had given these demands an unfavourable reception; he was opposed to the annexation of Constantinople by Russia. Sazonov, however, was absolutely firm and said that if the demands were not accepted he would resign, the Tsar, basing himself on Russian public opinion, also insisted on their full acceptance. It appears also that M. Delcassé was at first much disturbed by these demands, but, after further consideration, was prepared to accept them, the great thing being to avoid friction with Russia. There was obviously considerable anxiety lest refusal might give strength to the attempts which were being made at this time to detach Russia from the alliance.

11. After discussion in the Cabinet a telegram was sent on the 11th March to Sir George Buchanan, authorising him to present an *aide memoire* to M. Sazonov to the effect that "His Majesty's Government would agree to the Russian *aide memoire* about Constantinople and the Straits subject to the war being prosecuted to a victorious conclusion, and to Great Britain and France realising the desiderata in the Ottoman Empire and elsewhere as referred to in the Russian *aide memoire*."

12. The next day the following draft telegram was despatched to Sir George Buchanan after being approved by the Prime Minister, it was also communicated to the leaders of the Opposition:—

"In giving the Minister for Foreign Affairs the *aide memoire* about Constantinople and the Straits you should make the following observations:—

"The claim now made by the Russian Government goes much beyond what the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs indicated as probable a few weeks ago and Russia is asking for a definite promise in her favour as regards the greatest prize of the whole war before we have had time to consider what our own desiderata would be elsewhere in the eventual terms of peace.

"I hope therefore that the Minister for Foreign Affairs will realise that the *aide memoire* now given him is the greatest proof of friendship that it is in our power to give. It involves the complete abandonment of what has been our traditional policy and runs counter to opinions and sentiments once universal and still by no means extinct in this country, and will, I hope, be recognised as a most loyal and ample fulfilment of our previous general assurances made to the

that the settlement proposed will, when realised, make lasting friendship between the two countries. It follows that our own desiderata, however important to us elsewhere, will not include any conditions to impair Russian control over the territory described in her *aide memoire*.

"We shall ask that there should be commercial freedom of the Straits for merchant vessels, which the Minister for Foreign Affairs has already promised,

and that, as Constantinople will always be a trade entrepôt for South Eastern Europe and Asia Minor, Russia should, when in possession of it, arrange a free port for goods in transit to and from territory other than Russian.

"His Majesty's Government are engaged in operations in the Straits which it is now clear cannot, however successful, be of any advantage to them in the terms of peace, except in so far as they contribute to the general cause. The direct fruits of these operations will, if the war is successful, be gathered entirely by Russia. We think, therefore, that Russia should not now raise objection to the co-operation of any Power which offers its help as an ally on reasonable conditions. Greece is the only Power which is likely to participate in the operations in the Straits, and the Greek flotilla, if we could have secured its aid, would already have been of inestimable value as Admiral Carden is asking for more destroyers, and we have none to spare for him.

"One of the great objects in undertaking the operations in the Dardanelles was to bring the Balkan States over to our side. We trust that Russia will now

that future Russian possession of Constantinople and the Straits will be to their disadvantage, and that Russia will do all she can to make the prospect of participation in the war on the side of the Allies attractive to those two States.

"I cannot formulate British desiderata as to the Ottoman Empire except in consultation with the French as well as the Russian Government, and it is clear that the whole question of ulterior British and French interests, in what is now Asiatic Turkey must come under consideration, but whenever it becomes known that Russia is to have possession of Constantinople at the end of the war as stated in our *aide memoire*, I shall want to state that His Majesty's Government have throughout all the negotiations stipulated that in all circumstances Arabian and the Mussulman Holy Places shall remain under independent Mussulman rule.

"One of the British desiderata will be the revision of the Anglo-Russian Agreement about Persia recognising the present neutral sphere as a British sphere but I am not yet in a position to make any definite proposals on this or any other subject.

"If the Minister for Foreign Affairs asks whether we propose to make any conditions as to the fortification of the Straits or passage of ships of war, you may reply in the negative though it would seem reasonable for Roumania and Bulgaria to have special privileges accorded them by Russia as regards their ships of war.

"It is very desirable that the understanding now come to between the British, French and Russian Governments should not become known until the Allies are able to assure the Balkan States as to their position and prospects adjoining their frontiers, which they are known to desire, and until an agreement as to British and French desiderata in the ultimate terms of peace is more advanced.

"These observations, but it should be separate from the *aide memoire* of my telegram of 10th March which gives the official assent of His Majesty's Government.

"Copies of what is given to Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs can be given by you personally to the Emperor."

13. This telegram speaks of an understanding having been arrived at by the British, French and Russian Governments, and Sir Edward Grey seems to have received information that the French were prepared to accept the Russian *aide memoire* of the 4th March. It appears, however, that the French Government did not, in fact, give their official approval till nearly three weeks later. A telegram from M. Sazonov to M. Isvolsky of the 5th March, which is among the documents published by the Bolsheviks, runs as follows:—

"On the 23rd February/5th March the French Ambassador, on behalf of his Government, announced to me that France was prepared to take up a most telegram to you, No. 937 in respect of the Straits and Constantinople, for which I charged you to tender Delcassé my gratitude.

"In his conversations with you, Delcassé had previously more than once given his assurance that we could rely on the sympathy of France, and only referred to the need of elucidating the question of the attitude of England, from whom he feared some objections, before he could give us a more definite

ance in the above sense. Now the British Government has given its complete consent in writing to the annexation by Russia of the Straits and Constantinople within the limits indicated by us, and only demanded security for its economic interests and a similar benevolent attitude on our part towards the political aspirations of England in other parts.

"For me, personally filled as I am with most complete confidence in Delcassé, the assurance received from him is quite sufficient but the Imperial Government would desire a more definite pronouncement of France's assent to complete satisfaction of our desires, similar to that made by the British Government."

acceptance had not been given. It is clear from the correspondence that M. Delcassé and the French Government were at first surprised and embarrassed by the Russian demand for the actual annexation of Constantinople. They first suggested a personal conference with M. Sazonov, this he was unable to arrange, but it looks as if the British Government acted rather in advance of the French. The question of Constantinople and the opposition to Russian annexation had always been a special British point and the French might not unreasonably have held that it would be better for them to wait and leave the responsibility with the British.

14. We can see that both of the Allies were surprised and annoyed at the rather presumptuous attitude suddenly assumed by the Russians on this matter, they gave their consent with some reluctance, it was to be foreseen that this decision would have an unfavourable effect on the Balkan States there were many Greeks who held that it was not worth while going to war with Turkey to win Constantinople for Russia. The French in giving their consent seem to have been more influenced by their apprehension that in case of a refusal Russian loyalty to the alliance could not be depended upon, the English, who were just at that time becoming fully pledged to the Dardanelles expedition, were chiefly influenced by the desire to remove the Russian veto on the presence of a Greek force in the expedition.

15. The results of this agreement were very far reaching. As soon as Constantinople was promised to Russia the other Allies were compelled to place on record and ask for the adhesion of their Allies to the territorial claims which they would make in Turkey. The British required Mesopotamia, the French Syria, the British, in addition, were strongly interested in Central Asian problems, especially Persia, and more account of the Turkish ambitions in Asia than probably would otherwise have been done. It leads, therefore, inevitably to the whole series of agreements with

16. Clearly the action of the Russian Government in making a separate peace with Germany in 1918 deprives them or any future Russian Government of the legal right based upon the assent given to their claims by the exchange of notes in 1915. On the other hand, what has been done can never be completely undone and it will always remain on record that the British Government formally assented to the Russian annexation of Constantinople and control of the Straits. The policy of a great nation such as Russia is not permanently changed by abnormal events, even though they are of so violent a nature as those by which Russia has been distracted during the last four years. It at any time in the future Russia is reunited under a

class of the population, the claim to Constantinople and the Straits will again be made and it will certainly be urged that notwithstanding the *dédéc* of 1917 Russia deserves this recompense for her immense sacrifices in the earlier years of the war. It will be represented that it would be intolerable that in the partition of the Turkish Empire, Russia should be left entirely out of account. That which Russia in the past always feared was not the continuance of Turkish domination but the substitution of a patriotic Russian statesman would therefore desire that Turkey should be left with nominal sovereignty over Constantinople and all of Thrace east of the Enos-Med-

J. W. HEADLAM-MORLEY

February 22 1922

[E 2164 75 44]

No. 45.

Lord Hardinge to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received February 25)

(No 482)

My Lord,

Paris, February 24, 1922.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23rd inst. in relation to the mission of Lieutenant-Colonel Sarrau.

I have the honour to inform you that M. Poincaré has replied, of which copy is enclosed, stating that Lieutenant-Colonel Sarrau has succeeded to the functions of General Foulon, who was inspector-general of the Turkish gendarmerie constituted at the time of the armistice by the authorisation of the commander-in-chief of the Allied armies. M. Poincaré states that Lieutenant-Colonel Sarrau's mission cannot be held to be a purely military one, as the Turkish authority does not run. He therefore considers it preferable to leave him and his two colleagues, in view of their position under the authority of the French High Commissioner at Constantinople.

As to the Cilician gendarmerie, M. Poincaré explains that it is intended to meet local requirements alone, and will not interfere in any way with the general arrangements which may be made for the whole of Turkey as a result of the Treaty of Peace. It is with this object that the French rifles and clothing have been handed over to this body of gendarmerie, who are intended to maintain order in Cilicia. As for the aeroplanes, M. Poincaré states that they have been handed over to a French civilian society which has formally undertaken to employ them for commercial uses only.

I have, &c.

HARDINGE OF PENSHURST

Enclosure in No. 45

M. Poincaré to Lord Hardinge

Ministère des Affaires Étrangères,

Paris, le 23 février 1922

M. l'Ambassadeur,

VOTRE Excellence a bien voulu par sa lettre du 6 de ce mois me faire savoir que le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté estimerait que dans les questions ayant trait à la gendarmerie ottomane l'attitude des autorités françaises à Constantinople, et notamment celle du Lieutenant-Colonel Sarrau, ne répondrait pas aux assurances données à votre Excellence le 14 novembre dernier.

A cette date, mon prédécesseur spécifiait que M. Franklin-Bouillon n'avait obtenu ni demandé aucun monopole ou promesse de monopole pour l'organisation de la gendarmerie en Turquie. Comme le sait votre Excellence, M. Franklin-Bouillon s'est en effet borné à accuser réception d'une lettre par laquelle le Gouvernement d'Angora exprimait le désir de faire appel pour instruire la gendarmerie à des officiers français, sans que rien dans cette lettre eût entraîné la collaboration d'autres officiers étrangers.

L'assurance était en même temps donnée que, dans l'opinion du Gouvernement français, la nomination du Général Fillocneau, au caractère de sa mission n'étant en rien modifiée, pas plus d'ailleurs que la situation du Lieutenant-Colonel Sarrau.

Les intentions du Gouvernement français à cet égard n'ayant pas varié, il semble que l'on ne puisse attribuer à la situation actuelle de M. Sarrau aucun fait susceptible de créer quelque sujet d'inquiétude au Gouvernement de Sa Majesté.

La situation exacte du Lieutenant-Colonel Sarrau, qui fait l'objet des principales objections des autorités britanniques de Constantinople.

Comme le sait le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté, le commandant en chef des armées alliées a lancé au lendemain de l'armistice une mission de gendarmerie dont l'action ne pouvait après comme avant la guerre que contribuer au maintien de l'ordre en Turquie. Son chef, le Général Foulon, tenait du Gouvernement ottoman le titre d'inspecteur général de la gendarmerie. A sa mort, le commandement intermédiaire de cette mission a été exercé par l'officier le plus ancien, qui se trouve être actuellement le Lieutenant-Colonel Sarrau, sans d'ailleurs que cet officier assumât le titre d'inspecteur

Le maintien de cette mission, maintenant réduite à trois officiers, ne saurait faire obstacle au fonctionnement de la Sous-Commission de Gendarmerie. Ces officiers ne sont investis d'aucun pouvoir leur permettant de donner des ordres au commandement de la gendarmerie ou au Ministère de l'Intérieur, et par suite de contraindre l'action de la Sous-Commission de Gendarmerie. Leur rôle, purement technique, se limite aux régions où ne s'exerce pas l'autorité de la sous-commission.

Aucun motif n'apparaît donc de les placer sous les ordres de la sous-commission, plutôt que de les laisser sous l'autorité supérieure du Haut Commissaire français à Constantinople, de qui ils relèvent normalement à raison de leur nationalité.

Dans cette même lettre, votre Excellence m'informe du desir du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté de connaître le caractère et la destination de la force de gendarmerie à constituer, malgré la résolution de neutralité prise le 10 août 1921, le Gouvernement

lieux des cessions d'armes, d'aéronefs et de matériel de guerre.

J'ai l'honneur de faire savoir à votre Excellence que les appareils d'aviation cédés l'ont été à une société civile française, qui a pris l'engagement formel de ne l'utiliser que pour des fins commerciales.

Quant aux fusils, aux vêtements et aux chaussures, ils ont été cédés pour faciliter la constitution et avec des éléments pris sur place d'une gendarmerie destinée à maintenir l'ordre en Cilicie et dont j'ai le prime besoin de signaler à votre Excellence la nécessité pour la sécurité de la Syrie.

La constitution de cette gendarmerie qui répond uniquement à des besoins locaux ne saurait faire obstacle aux dispositions générales s'étendant à toute la Turquie, qui pourraient être adoptées comme conséquences du Traité de Paix avec ce pays. Ces mesures ne paraissent pas contraindre les efforts que poursuivent les Gouvernements alliés pour la paix générale en Orient, auquel, je serais obligé à votre

ment de la paix générale en Orient, auquel, je serais obligé à votre

français désire collaborer en plein accord avec le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté.

Je vous prie d'agréer, etc.

POINCARÉ.

E 2218 900 44}

No. 46

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received February 27)

No. 175.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 16, 1922.

As reported in my telegram No. 93 of the 9th instant, neither the Italian High Commissioner nor I attended the Te Deum service held here to celebrate the coronation of His Holiness Pope Pius XI.

2. In the account, however, of the ceremony given in the "Sтамбул" of the Commission in Constantinople, the following passages occurred: "Assistants à cette belle cérémonie les chefs des missions diplomatiques de notre ville, les représentants de Sa Majesté impériale le Sultan," etc.; and further on: "M. de Lafont, faisant fonction de Haut-Commissaire, occupait la place d'honneur."

3. My Italian colleague and I considered this account to be both misleading and provocative, in that it gave the impression that all the heads of missions here attended the service, and that it laid stress on the place of honour accorded to the French

4. The Marquis Garroni and I agreed that it would be impossible to allow this to pass unchallenged. We accordingly decided to cause an identic explanation of the circumstances to be published in the French and English papers of the 15th instant. In drawing up this statement, copy of the French version of which I have the honour to transmit herewith, great care, as your Lordship will observe, was taken both to the susceptibilities of the French High Commissioner, who in the interval between the two publications had returned to his

5. General Pelle was informed by the French representative on the Allied Censorship Bureau at a late hour on the evening of the 14th of the terms of our proposed publication, and immediately requested Capitaine Marchal to induce his British and Italian colleagues to Capitaine Marchal in this sense, he took exception to the statement that the

5th procès-verbal of the San Remo Conference laid down the renunciation by France of her right to protection over Catholics in the East. He stated that, according to the verbal information he had received in Paris, the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs did not admit this, and that if such an affirmation was published he would be obliged on his part to

6. Marquis Garroni, it would be unwise politically and contrary to the wishes of our Governments to permit the account given in the "Sтамбул" to remain uncorrected, and we instructed our censor officers to insist on the publication of our explanation in the terms in which it had originally been drawn up. I would add that General Pelle suggested an

I run: "The British and Italian High Commissioners hold the view that, under the 5th procès-verbal of the San Remo Conference, France renounced her right," &c. Neither Marquis Garroni nor I could of course accept a version of this nature, which would have indicated a complete misapprehension of the decided standpoint adopted on this subject both by His Majesty's Government and the Italian Government.

7. Our explanation accordingly appeared in French in the "Journal d'Orient" and in English in the "Orient News" on the morning of the 15th instant. It was followed in the evening edition of the "Sтамбул" on the same day by a rectification, the text of which I have also the honour to enclose.

may, pending a final decision between our respective Governments on the general point at issue, be considered as closed locally was, I am inclined to think, partly due to the exaggerated ideas which M. de Lafont, a somewhat second-rate consular officer, held of his own importance and of his position, in the absence of any regular diplomatic officer, as Acting French High Commissioner.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD

Enclosure 1 in No. 46.

Extract from the "Journal d'Orient" of February 15, 1922

UNE EXPLICATION

Les évènements de Benoît XV et Pie XI à la Cathédrale du Saint-Esprit.

SURPRISE de ne pas avoir noté la présence de leurs Excellences les Hauts-Commissaires de Grande-Bretagne et d'Italie parmi les chefs des missions diplomatiques à la Cathédrale du Saint-Esprit, l'un en suffrage canonique pour la mort de Sa Sainteté Benoît XV, l'autre en l'honneur de l'élévation au Pontificat du Pape Pie XI, nous nous sommes adressés aux Hauts-Commissaires britannique et d'Italie pour avoir des éclaircissements sur les raisons qui ont motivé cette abstention, et voici les renseignements qui nous ont été aimablement fournis à ce sujet.

Le règlement de la Congrégation vaticane de Propagande datant de 1742, reconnaît aux représentants français dans le Levant le droit à la prééminence et aux honneurs liturgiques dans les fonctions religieuses catholiques en Orient.

La loi de mai 1920 établit par contre la renonciation de la France à prétendre au droit de protectorat sur les catholiques en Orient ainsi qu'aux privilèges qui en découlent.

Une divergence d'interprétation s'étant produite quant à la date d'application de la décision de San-Remo, les Hauts-Commissaires de Grande-Bretagne et d'Italie ont

leur présence des privilèges honorifiques susmentionnés aurait été contraire à la manière de voir nettement établie de leurs Gouvernements respectifs.

Il est bien entendu que cette abstention ne saurait être en aucune façon considérée comme un manque d'égards envers la France, ni comme un manque d'égards envers le Souverain Pontife honore dans les deux fonctions

AUSPICES OF THE CONFERENCE

SOUS le titre "Une Explication," un journal du matin a publié une note aux termes de laquelle la France, à la Conférence de San Remo, aurait renoncé à prétendre au droit de protectorat sur les catholiques en Orient ainsi qu'aux privilèges qui en

D'après les renseignements que nous avons reçus d'une source autorisée, cette manière de voir n'est pas celle du Gouvernement français. Ainsi les divergences d'interprétation portent non seulement sur la date d'application de la décision de San Remo, mais sur le fond même de la question.

E 2225 5 44]

No. 47

Sir H. Rumhold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received February 27)

(No. 185)

My dear Sir,

Constantinople February 18, 1922

IN my telegram No. 102 of yesterday's date, I had the honour to report the substance of my conversation with Yumuf Kemal Bey, and I would only supplement that telegram by the following remarks:

Yumuf Kemal Bey arrived at Constantinople in the afternoon of the 15th instant. On the 16th he was accompanied by a French naval officer to detain a destroyer to patrol the Gulf of Issik, whilst Yumuf Kemal's train was on its way from Issik to Haidar. Yumuf Kemal Bey was met by the French naval officer at the station. The two called at the Embassy at 2 p.m. and remained for two hours.

Yumuf Kemal Bey is a smallish man of about 50 years of age. He was dressed with great care. His right hand has been injured. He speaks French fluently. His demeanour throughout the conversation was very quiet. He expressed himself temperately and in marked contrast with the tone of his communications to the High Commissioners.

I made no allusion to the Central Government during our interview. The papers state that Yumuf Kemal Bey and his wife, who were in Angora together just over a year ago on a mission from the Central Government.

The impression I derived from the interview was that Yumuf Kemal Bey was beginning to appreciate some of the difficulties in the way of the full realisation of the National Pact. I think he will realise these difficulties more and more as he gets made a great point of the danger to which Constantinople might be exposed if the Government were to move to the interior. He also made a great point of the danger to which Constantinople might be exposed if the Government were to move to the interior. He also made a great point of the danger to which Constantinople might be exposed if the Government were to move to the interior.

recently seen a report which showed that the population of Adrianople had greatly decreased. He pointed out that this was true of Eastern Thrace generally. Yumuf Kemal Bey pointed out that there had been considerable displacements of the population since the war. He said that the population could not be considered as normal.

The fact that in discussing the question of the abolition of the Capitulations Yumuf

4. M. Mery noticed that women and children were at work in the fields, which did not present an uncultivated appearance. Without expressing an opinion on the

...ory, M. Mery said that the ...
Anatolian peasantry, as ...

contrary to the resolve of the latter

5. My informant described Angora as a wretched place containing but few decent European houses. He was evidently disgusted by the appearance of most of the members of the National Assembly, whom he described as an unwashed and ignorant rabble, the only respectable element among them being a few lawyers and doctors. A party opposed to Mustapha Kemal was in process of formation. Mustapha Kemal himself lives 6 or 7 kilom. outside Angora, and a special road has been made for his benefit.

6. The Departments of the Angora Government seem to be run with a minimum of officials, thus he thought that there were not more than seven or eight persons employed in the Foreign Department. The Commissary for Foreign Affairs had a small room in the offices of the Public Debt at Angora.

7. Mery stated that Dr Kurich and he had endeavoured, while at Angora, to induce Kemal Bey to agree to the International Red Cross assisting at the ... for the relief of certain distressed regions. Yussuf Kemal

keeping with the dignity of the Nationalists. The same request was ... Kemal Bey at Constantinople, and he agreed to it. This proved, in M. Mery's opinion, that Yussuf Kemal Bey looked at matters from a different angle at Constantinople. In other words, the Angora politicians are living in a world of their own.

8. M. Mery was decidedly of opinion that, except for the question of the evacuation of Asia Minor by the Greeks, the Nationalists were asking for much more than they hoped to obtain.

I have, &c
HORACE RUMBOLD

E 2502 5 44

No 50

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received March 6)

(No. 212)
My Lord,

Constantinople, February 28, 1922

WHEN Hamid Bey first informed me of Yussuf Kemal Bey's projected visit to the Allied capitals to explain the Nationalist point of view, he stated that the main ... would be to take contact with the Allied High Commissioners. I observed at the time to Hamid Bey that I presumed that Yussuf Kemal Bey would take advantage of his stay at Constantinople to exchange views with the Central Government. Hamid ... no doubt visit such Turkish Ministers as were personally known to him.

Kemal Bey's visit to Constantinople was to get the Central Government to agree to authorize him to speak on their behalf as well as on behalf of the Angora Government. He has bent all his energies to that end, and, according to a reliable report, has been supported in this by the French High Commissioner. The latter's *démarche* cannot, however, have been palatable to the Central Government, since it took no account of such shades of dignity as the ...

trustworthy information.

Kemal Bey

Deputy

mission is qualified to ...

9. Hamid Bey originally stated to me that Yussuf Kemal Bey ... consist of the Nationalist Minister for Foreign Affairs ...

at ... arranged to leave Constantinople for Marseilles on the 1st March. The Italian High Commissioner informs me that he urged on Yussuf Kemal Bey the advisability of

... straight to London. Whether this was his original intention or ... Nationalist Minister for Foreign Affairs has in fact arranged to go straight to London.

1. During his stay here Yussuf Kemal Bey has had interviews with various journalists and has, generally speaking, made something of a stir. I have the honour to enclose the account* of an interview between him and a representative of the "Aurora," a British weekly independent paper, as published in this week's edition of that paper. It will be seen that Yussuf Kemal Bey denies that there is hope to England either at Angora or in the whole of Anatolia. This is not borne out

... gentleman stated emphatically that the feeling in Anatolia was bitterly hostile to England. (See my telegram No. 121 of the 27th February.)

2. The visits of Yussuf Kemal Bey to the Allied High Commissioners have been kept out of the local press at the instance of my French and Italian colleagues, probably with a view to sparing the susceptibilities of the Central Government. There have been rumours that the Sultan had refused to receive Yussuf Kemal Bey and again that he had received him. It is now known from a secret source that the Sovereign did in fact receive the Nationalist Foreign Minister.

3. Though I am not able to report in any detail what my colleagues said to ... moderation in regard to the question of the proposed abolition of the Capitulations

to flourish the National Part in the face of Allied statesmen and expect them to swallow it whole.

4. I am inclined to appreciate the position somewhat as follows:

The Nationalists have made their maximum military effort and know they cannot ... more. The Greek army is still facing them and, although they express confidence to foreign observers that they can expel the Greeks from Asia Minor, the Nationalists realize perfectly well that such an operation, even if feasible, will subject their army to a very severe strain. If therefore they can, under a settlement, obtain the evacuation of Asia Minor, they will, provided the Allies show a united front on other questions, have to face the necessity for a compromise on those questions. I would make one exception, however, in the case of the northern shore of the Sea of Marmora. Turks of all shades of opinion will not rest content until the ... left that shore, but it might in the last resort be possible to get the ... an arrangement under which the League of Nations would take over the peninsula. The peninsula is thinly inhabited and not very fertile and could be held by a small force of gendarmes.

I have, &c
HORACE RUMBOLD

E 2503 5 44,

No 51

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received March 6)

(No. 213)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 28, 1922

WITH reference to my telegram No. 122, I have the honour to report that Izzet Pasha, in discussing with me the prospects of a settlement on the Near Eastern question, said that he recognized that the Turks must take account of the *amour-propre* of England. He meant by this that they ought not to expect England to give way on any point in which her honour was involved. I did not ask Izzet Pasha to define his meaning more precisely, but I infer that he was referring in particular to the question of the freedom of the Straits. Izzet Pasha also said that the Turks must take into account the legitimate commercial interests of England.

2. On the other hand, His Highness repeated that all the Turks ask for is to be allowed to keep what they consider their own possessions. They had been scorned of

... On my remarking that in my view it would not be possible to grant Turkey all the conditions contained in the national pact Izzet Pasha replied that it would be ... to find a middle course.

Izzet Pasha admitted to me that Yussuf Kemal Bey had proposed to the

* Not printed.

Central Government that he should be authorised to speak in their name during his forthcoming visit to the Allied capitals. But the Central Government could not admit this, and I suspect that Izzet Pasha's contemplated journey to London is designed to forestall Yussuf Kemal Bey and to see what he can effect on his own account. Izzet Pasha has this advantage over Yussuf Kemal Bey, in that he is less likely to be disavowed by the Central Government than is Yussuf Kemal Bey by Mustapha Kemal or the National Assembly. In other words, Izzet Pasha can probably deliver the goods, whereas Yussuf Kemal Bey does not appear to have the power to bind the Angora Government.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,

High Commissioner

E 2472 2472 44]

No. 52

Lord Hardinge to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received March 6.)

(No. 561.)

My Lord,

Paris, March 4, 1922.

AS reported in my despatch No. 38 of the 4th January, 1921, the French Government in 1920 granted a subvention of 500,000 fr. to the Society of the Habous of the Holy Places towards the erection of a Muslim institute and mosque in Paris.

the 1st March, and was made the occasion of a demonstration of Franco-Muslim friendship. The ceremony was presided over by M. Corat, Under-Secretary of State, and was attended by representatives of the President of the Republic and of Marshal Lyncey, who was introduced, by Marshal Franchet d'Espèrey, M. de Peretti de la Rocca, and other high officials of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and M. Reinard Harriot, deputy for the Rhodan and ex-Minister, the Prefect of the Seine, and the

Chamberlain of the Sultan of Morocco, by the "Ministre de la Plume" of the Bey of Tunis, by delegates of the Union of the Muslim Communities of the African section of the Ministry of the Colonies, and by the Association of the Habous of the Holy Places.

Sidi Kaddour, in a speech praising the French administration of Morocco, expressed the gratitude of Muslims to France for the homage paid by her to them in connection with the war. The President of the Seine followed with speeches praising the part played by Muslim soldiers in the war, and M. Corat closed the ceremony with a summary of the relations between France and Islam from the days of François I, and a eulogy of the policy and aims of France in her dealings with Muslim peoples.

I have, &c.

HARDINGE OF PENSHURST

E 2471 5 44

No. 53

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to M. Gounaris

Your Excellency,

Foreign Office, March 8, 1922

I HAVE the pleasure to inform you that the Government of France have agreed to the proposal of the British Government to the effect that the British Government should be authorised to speak in their name during his forthcoming visit to the Allied capitals. But the Central Government could not admit this, and I suspect that Izzet Pasha's contemplated journey to London is designed to forestall Yussuf Kemal Bey and to see what he can effect on his own account. Izzet Pasha has this advantage over Yussuf Kemal Bey, in that he is less likely to be disavowed by the Central Government than is Yussuf Kemal Bey by Mustapha Kemal or the National Assembly. In other words, Izzet Pasha can probably deliver the goods, whereas Yussuf Kemal Bey does not appear to have the power to bind the Angora Government.

2. An important transaction was hoped by your Government to raise a

substantial loan in the London market. His Majesty's Government have, as you know, endeavoured, within the limits of their publicly declared neutrality and of the engagements entered into with their Allies, to lighten the difficulties by which these negotiations were attended, and if, as I am informed, they have failed to produce the desired result, this would appear to have been due in the main to obstacles connected with the commercial, rather than with the political, aspects of the proposed transaction.

3. In these circumstances, the wisest course is unquestionably to expedite the proposed transaction. It is to be regretted that owing to circumstances over which His Majesty's Government have had no control the proposed meeting of the Allied Ministers in Paris has been so long delayed. An Italian Ministry having however now been formed, I have hastened to propose that the conference should meet in Paris on the 18th March—a date which at the moment of writing seems likely to be again postponed for a few days to meet the convenience of the new Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs. I have little doubt that the first subject that will come under examination there will be the Anatolian question, and I earnestly hope that a solution may be found which will be acceptable to both parties and may relieve you of the more serious apprehensions by which you are assailed.

4. Your Government has already placed itself, in accordance with the advice which I ventured to tender to you last autumn, in the hands of the Allies, and I doubt not therefore that in a similar spirit of confidence and good faith you will be prepared to meet the difficulties of the immediately existing situation.

I have, &c.

CURZON OF KEDLESTON

E 2752 5/44]

No. 54

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received March 13.)

(No. 225.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 6, 1922.

WITH reference to my telegrams Nos. 134 and 135 of the 4th and 5th March giving the main points of Mustapha Kemal Pasha's speech at the opening session of the Grand National Assembly at Angora on the 1st instant, I have the honour to transmit herewith a translation of the speech as given by the Anatolian Agency on the 1st instant. The passages italicized were cut out by the Litar Akis Press (Constantinople).

2. I venture to draw your Lordship's attention to paragraphs 6 and 7 of the speech in which Mustapha Kemal Pasha speaks with regard to the Treaty of Sèvres. His statement, that the treaty concluded in 1921 with the Allies, showed that the Treaty of Sèvres was a betrayal of the interests of the Turkish people, is very interesting. Mustapha Kemal Pasha's speech is a very important document, and it is to be regretted that the translation of it is not yet complete. It is to be hoped that the translation will be completed in a few days. I have the honour to be, Sir, your Lordship's obedient servant.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,

High Commissioner

*Speech by Mustafa Kemal Pasha in the Grand National Assembly, Angora,
March 1*

(Report by Anatolian Agency, Angora, March 2.)

(Translation.)

Our internal organisation is based upon the unrestricted sovereignty of the people. Accordingly, to give this sovereignty effectively to the people bills relating to provincial administrative councils, to Communal education, to inspect general and to the duty and responsibilities of the Council of Commissioners have been prepared and in part. Respect of the racial and social rights of the composite Turkish

of internal order. The Turkish in
dised nations to similar minorities
however be given that the Muslim inhabitants of foreign

2. After referring to such matters as the assistance rendered during the past year to refugees, Mustafa Kemal Pasha also mentioned the justice. "It is the most elementary duty of the State to enforce the law and to distribute justice equitably. It is essential for us to standard of justice to that of every civilised State. We respect. We cannot, however, allow anyone to interfere in the distribute which is the inalienable right of every independent State. In enumerating the measures taken by the Department of Justice to attain these objects, Mustafa Kemal Pasha mentioned the extension of the system of a single judge, the central magistrature, of a suitable system for dealing with sections of the population, the State, and finally of a faculty of law

to our economic life, he began by saying "The best and most useful of our land and continuous agriculture." "The efforts of the present generation without stint both on the field of battle and on

the far
attempts have been
a of a market

and the history and geography of his native land, and at the same time learned specialists in science and art with a view to forming a civilised

historic and civilised countries of the present day. The press is a most important power, a school and a guide to enlighten this nation, to give it the intellectual food it needs and to direct it to its goal, which is deliverance." (Loud and prolonged applause.) "Therefore our Government will devote special consideration to educational and press

with the precepts of the Koran, and in order that the people may fully enjoy the

regard to pious foundations (causes), our Government is paying attention to the present of these religious foundations, the object of which is social assistance."

6. With regard to our foreign policy, he stated that our friendship with Russia was the foundation of our foreign relations, and explained the development of the phases of our friendly relations with that State. He said that "thanks to the

conference of Kars of last year, followed by the treaty of friendship which Kravze, the representative of Urmia, concluded at Angora, our State was in perfect accord with the States of Russia, Urmia, Azerbaijan, Bokhara, Afghanistan, Georgia and Armenia. Our commercial and economic relations with these States were developed from day to day. He mentioned separately the names of the Russian Ambassador, Aralof, of the Caraman representative, Kravze, and of the Ambassadors of the Muslim States represented at Angora, and said that the treaties concluded in the same year with the Russian republics and with France showed that the Treaty of Sevres would be incapable of application. The fact that one of the most powerful of the States that signed the Treaty of Sevres, viz., France, had come to a separate understanding with the whole world that

In describing our foreign policy, he used
"regarding the rights of any other nation. We are simply defending
and our country, and we shall continue to do so. The responsibility
our just claims are not recognised, falls, of course, upon those
responsible for the non-recognition. They must know that there is no weakening in the
desire and hope of the nation, or in its capacity and power to fight. It is our

to defend, strengthen a
justice of the national will. It is therefore hoped that certain personages
here at Constantinople will refrain from prejudicing the position and work
of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey."

8. His Excellency the Pasha then reviewed the events of the world during the last year, and mentioned that the Government had taken the necessary steps Turkey should be invited to the Vienna Conference.

9. He referred next to the heroic army, which was the most devoted element of our nation and enumerated the deeds accomplished last year on the eastern and western fronts. He held up to general execration the violence and ravages committed by the Greeks, with their priests and generals at their head.

10. Mustafa Kemal Pasha summed up the year's labours of the Assembly, and concluded his speech with the following words: "My respected and dear comrades, the solidarity of the Assembly and the nation and the joy we shall show in accepting the sacrifices imposed upon us by events are the strongest guarantees of final success. We enter the New Year in a sure but more solemn spirit than ever before. We shall proceed relentlessly towards our sacred goal, which is for us the flame of life, and for future generations the hope of salvation, and with the divine help we shall surely succeed. This country will not die, and if—to suppose what is impossible—it were to die, the surface of the globe would not sustain the immense coffin." (Loud applause.)

E 2753 27 44

No. 55

Sir H. Humboldt to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received March 13.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 6, 1922

I HAVE the honour to transmit the following translation of a message of the special correspondent of the "Vakt" at Angora, which appeared in to-day's issue of that newspaper, giving the text of the speeches made by M. Aralof, the Russian Soviet Ambassador at Angora, and of Mustafa Kemal Pasha, president of the Grand National Assembly, at a banquet in the Russian Soviet Embassy, on the 3rd March:—

Angora, March 5.—At a banquet given at the Russian Embassy the evening before yesterday, the Russian Ambassador, Aralof, made the following speech:—

'There is a very strong bond of friendship between the Government of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey and the Russian Soviet Republic. The two countries are struggling for independence and freedom. We shall be the future in this struggle as we have been in the past. The Turkish army will shortly achieve final victory. Before finishing my speech, I raise my glass, the contents of which are pure, clean water, and express the wish that our friendship may be clean like this pure water.'

"Mustapha Kemal Pasha replied to this speech as follows:—

Consul Aralof has a place in our heart, not simply because he is the Russian representative, but on account of his precious personality. Russia first of all campaign against Imperialism, and all beginnings are difficult. But the Russians won a sacred victory. The attention of the oppressed was attracted. Turkey saw the necessity of rising and taking up arms to preserve their independence. To be powerful together we must be powerful individually. Consul Aralof took as an illustration of the relations of the two Governments the purity of the water in his glass. I desire that we shall be bound as tightly together as the hydrogen and oxygen of which that water is composed.

The Ambassadors, the principal commissioners, Yussuf Akchura Bey, Agthaoghlu Ahmed Bey and Yunus Nadi Bey were present at the banquet.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner.

E 2756 5 44

No 56

to H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received March 13.)

No. 221. Confidential.

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 7, 1922

AS I had the honour to report to your Lordship in my personal and secret telegram of the 25th February, Yussuf Kemal Bey and his mission left Constantinople for Paris on the 26th.

That when Yussuf Kemal Bey went on board the Turkish flag was run up at the fore. A large crowd saw him off, and he is reported to have said that his visit to Constantinople had satisfied him that he could speak on behalf of the whole of Turkey.

2. Iszet Pasha and his mission left on the 4th March by Orient express, intending to proceed direct to London. Up to the last minute he was in two minds as to stopping in Paris en route. He was afraid that if he went straight through to London he might lay himself open to the charge of want of courtesy towards the French Government. But, as at the moment of his departure it appeared likely that the Near Eastern Conference in Paris would meet on the 13th instant, he sent me a message to say that he had decided to go straight to England in the first instance. I think it possible that, when they learn that the Eastern Conference has been still further adjourned, both missions will stop a few days in Paris before proceeding to London.

3. There is no doubt that both Yussuf Kemal Bey and the French High Commissioner are much put out by the action of the Central Government in sending Iszet Pasha independently to the Allied capitals. The French High Commissioner, whether from a desire to play up to the Nationalists or because he genuinely wishes to terminate the present duality in the Government of Turkey, worked hard to obtain authorisation for Yussuf Kemal Bey's mission. His failure in both cases will not tend to improve his position.

4. If I correctly appreciate the situation, Yussuf Kemal Bey's visit to Constantinople has had the effect of somewhat stiffening the attitude of the Central Government in regard to the terms of a settlement. Yussuf Kemal Bey has dealt with the situation as he may see fit, and it is certain that the attitude of the Turkish Government towards the Allies is not likely to be improved by his visit.

as a whole must be largely influenced by the development of the military situation in the West. Lordship by M. Gounaris dated the 15th February, is very significant in this connection. Should the Greek army receive the order to evacuate Anatolia as speedily as possible there will be no limit to the Kemalist pretensions, and a settlement which the Allies could accept with any self-respect will be impossible.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner.

E 2756 5 44]

No 57

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received March 13.)

(No. 231)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 7, 1922

THE Grand Vizier, who is now in charge of the Foreign Department during the absence of Iszet Pasha, called on me yesterday.

2. His Highness began by recapitulating the attitude of the Angora Government last year when he transmitted an invitation to that Government to attend the conference in London. He also alluded to the manner in which, according to his own account, the Government had behaved towards the Allies.

He then went on to say that the Government was now in a position to make concessions which would be acceptable to the Allies, but that the Government was not prepared to make concessions which would be acceptable to the Nationalists. He then went on to say that the Government was now in a position to make concessions which would be acceptable to the Allies, but that the Government was not prepared to make concessions which would be acceptable to the Nationalists.

3. The Grand Vizier then went on to say that the effect of strengthening the authority of the Constantinople Government, whereas if the concessions in question were made to Yussuf Kemal Bey's mission they would only be the signal for still further demands from the Nationalists.

4. It is clear that in making the proposal the Grand Vizier continued true to the plan which he has before now developed to me, namely, to secure an acceptable arrangement and then endeavour to work on Anatolia to accept it. From a further remark which he let fall, to the effect that Iszet Pasha was not trained in the art of diplomacy, I infer that the two Ministers possibly do not see eye to eye at the present moment. Iszet Pasha has indeed seen a good deal of Yussuf Kemal Bey during the latter's stay in Constantinople, he is anyhow moderate Nationalist in his views, and it may be that he is willing to go further than his chief.

5. In reply to my enquiry as to whether Yussuf Kemal Bey had seen the Sultan, the Grand Vizier replied that he would tell me in confidence that such had been the case. He added that I was the only person to whom he had admitted that this interview had taken place. He said that Yussuf Kemal Bey had come to him with Iszet Pasha with a request to be received by the Sultan. The Grand Vizier had replied that the Sultan could certainly not receive Yussuf Kemal Bey in his capacity as Foreign Minister of the Angora Government, whereupon Yussuf Kemal Bey said that he wished to be received as one of His Majesty's subjects. According to the Grand Vizier, Yussuf Kemal Bey gave His Majesty assurances of loyalty to his authority and person on the part of the Angora authorities. Tewfik Pasha denied that the Sultan had expressed an opinion one way or the other with regard to Yussuf Kemal Bey's mission.

6. I then asked the Grand Vizier whether he had any further to say on the subject, and he replied that he had nothing further to say. He then went on to say that he had already heard from Hamid Bey, the Nationalist representative in the National Assembly, that the Nationalists were not prepared to accept any arrangement which would be a cause of future war. I observed to his Highness that I did not believe that either Serbia or Roumania would acquiesce in Turkey being given a

I have the
HONORABLE MEMBERS
High Commissioners

No. 88

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received March 13.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 7, 1922

WITH reference to my despatch No. 232, Secret, dated this day, transmitting translations of certain documents which were stated to have been in the possession of Kemal Bey secretary of Yusuf Kemal Bey's Mission to Europe, I have the honour to transmit the following information, received from the same source

2. Krishna Bay stated in conversation during his stay in Ceylon Grand National Assembly had allocated a sum of £ T. 160,000, at rate of exchange in a little less than 25,000/-, to the mission. Of this sum £ T. 50,000 were for travelling expenses and the remaining £ T. 110,000 for desert purposes.

3 Among other statements attributed to Kemal Bey are the following: When Prince Esmir Farouk Keffendi was sent back from Istanbul to Constantinople early in 1921, Huseinidsh Sabhi Bey a member of the Grand National Assembly telegraphed the news to Angora, stating that the Prince wished to reign in Anatolia. This telegram was read to the Grand National Assembly and several Deputies denounced the Prince. The Deputies were given to understand that the Sultan was sold to the British, and the

constituencies and carry on an anti-democratic propaganda. This propaganda did not
the inhabitants of which are devoted to the Sultanate and the Caliphate

The last time M Franklin-Baillon was at Angora he had advocated the dual system of Angora and Constantinople. Mustapha Kemal Pasha had told him that this could only be accomplished by the dethronement of the Sultan, who was a slave of the English and had betrayed his country.

3. Shortly before his interview with M. Poincaré, Yusef Kemal Bey telegraphed to Ferid Bey, the representative of the Angora Government in Paris, that as long as the present Sultan was on the throne it was impossible to do anything for the French, and that the English were the most important factors in a settlement of the Near Eastern question. In principle the French are of the same opinion, but they are unable to enter

6 The Angola Government were being pressed by the Russians to grant them mining concessions, and would probably have to give them more than twenty mines. Their only hope was to obtain more favourable terms from the French before the 20th March, when they would have to give a definite answer to the Russians. The question was of vital importance for the Angola Government.

Persons in touch with Mustapha Kemal Pasha have the greatest respect for him and this respect has, if possible, increased of late through admiration of his activity.

character, the saviour and protector of the nation, than in that of an ignorant Sovereign, whose sole ambition is to continue to reign. As Yusuf Kemal Bey said to J. Mukhtar Bey a few days ago at the office of the Red Crescent, "The Sultan requires

anything new

I have, &c.
HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner.

Department of Overseas Trade to Foreign Office. — (Received March 14.)

THE Comptroller-General of the Department of Overseas Trade presents his compliments to the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and transmits herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Commercial Secretary, Constantinople, dated the 3rd instant, respecting French interests in Turkey.

Department of Overseas Trade

enclosure 1 in No. 59

Commercial Secretary, Constantinople, to Department of Overseas Trade

Sur.

British High Commission, Constantinople, March 3 1929

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a summarized translation of a report made by the Director of the Official French Commerce in Constantinople recently. Whilst they are, of course, strongly pro-French, they are, however, valuable in their indication of the very strong financial representation that France has built up in Turkey.

I have the

C H COURTNEY M'NICHOL

Epoch 2 is No. 59

French Interests in Turkey.

FRANCE exercises a considerable control over Turkish finances, owing to the large amount of French capital invested in Ottoman public funds and in private enterprises.

The Ottoman Public Debt

In the securities of the Ottoman Public Debt (interior and exterior) France has invested about 2½ milliard francs representing 60·34 per cent of the total capital of the debt, against 14·19 per cent. British capital and 21·18 per cent. German capital.

[illegible]

	1	Σ I 1 584 069
" = 1	"	362 397
" "	"	"
" " 1	"	"
" " 4m	"	"

The assistance of French financiers has been utilised by the Turkish Ministry of Finance to reform the entire organisation of the budget and to institute an inspection of Turkish Government finances.

Turkish Loans.

The history of Turkish loans commenced with the Crimean war

which, were entirely due to the assistance of French financial houses. France's only rivals in Turkey were certain English banks and a powerful Austrian syndicate.

3. 1875-1881.—In 1876 the Ottoman Treasury was unable to provide more than half the interest due on the external debt of the country, and this state of things continued until 1881. On the 26th December, 1881, the Decree of Mouharrem was signed, which granted to the institution known as the Ottoman Public Debt, consisting of the holders of Turkish bonds, the right to collect and administer certain revenues of the State.

3. 1881-1907.—The liquidation effected by the Decree of Mouharrem did not take into account the floating debt of Turkey. To liquidate this six loans were floated, the capital of all six being entirely French.

4. 1903-1914.—This period is marked by great German activity, particularly on the part of the Constantinople-Bagdad Railway and the supply of military stores. Four loans were raised during this period, of which France subscribed entirely to one, Germany to four, England to one, and the twelfth was divided between France, England and Germany. A loan of 800,000,000 fr. was floated in April 1914, being partly subscribed to by a French syndicate.

French Commercial Interests in Turkey

Of the foreign capital invested in this way, France has 58.55 per cent, and Germany 32.77 per cent. French capital is invested in the leading banks, railways, mines, harbour construction works, and in the amount of capital invested in Turkey by France, Germany and Great Britain—

	Capital	Interest
France	202,427,000	10,121,350
Germany	220,427,000	11,021,350
Great Britain	152,427,000	7,621,350

(A) The Régie Tabacco Monopoly.

The Decree of Mouharrem granted to the Ottoman Public Debt the control of tobacco culture and the monopoly of sale of tobacco throughout the whole of the Turkish Empire. This administration in 1884 evolved its rights to a limited company with the name of "Régie d'intercession des Tabacs de l'Empire ottoman." The Régie was founded by the joint action of three financial groups, the first English-French being that of the Ottoman Public Debt Bank. The capital of the Régie was 100,000,000 fr., represented by 200,000 shares. Of this capital about half was provided by France, the remainder being principally Austrian. The president, vice-president and director-general of the board of directors of the company are supplied by France.

(B.) Banks

Both England and France have large financial interests in the many banks in Turkey, and prior to the war Germany was also showing great activity in this direction. Since the armistice Italy has made great progress, and has opened many branches of her big banks in Constantinople, Asia Minor and Caucasus.

(a). *Imperial Ottoman Bank.* The Imperial Ottoman Bank was founded 1863 by an English-French group. The shares were originally approximately divided equally between France and Great Britain, but at the present time France holds by far the largest proportion of these shares. The administration of the bank is run by a committee of twenty members, of whom ten are resident in France and ten in Britain. At the present time the director-general, M. Steeg, is a Frenchman. The Imperial Ottoman Bank is now an essential factor in Turkish finance. Its privileges are the following—

1. It is the only bank allowed to issue its own notes.
2. It is the treasurer and payee-general to the Empire.
3. It is the Ottoman Government's financial agent.

The bank was for a long time the only important financial establishment working in Turkey. It has branches in Constantinople, Smyrna, Beirut, and Aleppo, and five in Greece, two in France and two in England.

(b). *Banque de Salonique.*—Banque de Salonique was founded 1888 with French, Austrian, Hungarian and Greek capital. The capital has now been raised to 20,000,000 fr., the greater part of which was subscribed to in France, and the board of directors is entirely French. The Turkish branches of the bank are in Constantinople, Adrianople, Smyrna, Beyrouth and Samarra.

(N.B.—It is reported that the Crédit foncier d'Algérie et de Tunisie has recently taken over this bank.)

(c). *Crédit Lyonnais.*—The three chief agencies of this bank in the Near East are at Constantinople, Smyrna and Jerusalem, and there are other branches in various towns.

(d). *Banque française pour les Pays d'Orient.*—The branch of this bank at Constantinople has only recently been opened, but it represents French commercial and industrial interests on a large scale.

(e). *Banque commerciale pour la Méditerranée.* This bank was opened at Constantinople at the beginning of 1920 under the patronage of La Banque de la Méditerranée. It is a branch of the French Industrial Bank, and is concerned with precious metals and metal refinery.

French capital is also well represented in foreign banks, such as the Bank of Athens, the Maronach Bank, &c.

The distribution of foreign banks in Constantinople, apart from French, is as follows—

Italy	Banca di Roma Banca Commerciale
England	National Bank of Turkey, Anglo-Lebanese Bank
United States	Guaranty Trust Company, American Express Company
Holland	One
Greece	One
Roumania	One

Lighthouses

The administration of all Turkish lighthouses is purely French, being administered by a company with its head office in Paris. The company is the concessionaire for all Turkish lighthouses in the Mediterranean, Dardanelles, Black Sea, Red Sea and the Persian Gulf.

Roads

In July 1910 a contract was made between the Ottoman Government and a French company for the construction of State roads to a total length of 2,000 kilom. Work in this connection was in full operation on the outbreak of war. La Société française d'Entreprises has now taken up this question again.

Railways

There has been active competition between France, Great Britain and Germany for an active share in the construction of Turkish railways. The following table shows the

Mr Ocha mentioned to me, in the course of conversation, that he had gathered from a number of different sources in Constantinople that discrimination was being made against American trade and that American merchants were being placed at a disadvantage as against Allied traders. Though Mr Ocha quoted no specific examples of this, I am inclined to believe that the British authorities were the principal instigators of the alleged unfair treatment which was being accorded to American commerce. As I was aware that Mr Ocha is a partisan of Anglo-American co-operation, I did my utmost to dissuade him.

2. There is some reason to suspect that Mr Ocha's illusions were gained from the Admiral Bristol is perhaps unaccustomed to the He is somewhat prone to disregard the difficulties with but the three Allied High Commissions jointly he idea that they are taking advantage self position to hamper American enterprise. During the first eight months of my residence here the relations between the three High Commissions and Admiral Bristol were cordial. The latter complained that he was continually being presented with accomplished facts in respect of measures which affected American interests, and the former that Admiral Bristol repeatedly opposed measures which they considered it necessary to introduce.

3. I do not wish to argue the rights or wrongs of that state of affairs. It was certainly undesirable and I did my best to remedy it. My colleagues were irritated by Admiral Bristol's methods, and it was largely due to this High Commission that a improvement in those relations was eventually effected. The Allied High Commissions have been at pains for the past six months to consult Admiral Bristol whenever American citizens or interests are concerned. An American delegation is on equal footing with the Allied delegates on the Advisory Trade Council.

4. The Admiral is certainly less uncompromising in some respects, he has failed I fear, in other questions to appreciate the conciliatory attitude of the Allied High Commissions, and has in fact been no less yielding than before. I refer more particularly to the questions of consumption taxes and inflammable liquids, both of which have formed the subject of despatches from me to your Lordship. He is probably hampered by instructions from his Government on these matters.

5. As I had the honour to observe in my despatch No. 181 of the 21st February, 1922, American policy here would appear to be dictated to an appreciable degree by the interests of the Standard Oil Company which is primarily interested in those two questions. It is I cannot but help believing, due to this fact and the suspicion that the Allied attitude here is inspired by a British determination to combat American enterprise throughout the world, that Admiral Bristol has an impression that American trade with Turkey is being hampered at the instigation of this High Commission. It is unnecessary for me to assure your Lordship that this is not the case. Our attempts to satisfactory settlement of the inflammable liquids controversy appear indeed likely to end in failure and the question will in all probability be referred back to his

correspondence on this subject, to supplement that contained in my despatch No. 181 of the 21st February last, as soon as my Allied colleagues and I are in agreement as to the definite standpoint we propose to adopt. It is conceivable that our inability meet Admiral Bristol's wishes in this matter may revive the question of the consumption taxes in an acute form. Those taxes have hitherto been paid under protest by

of his Government to instruct his compatriots to refuse to pay them in future. Action in this sense would provoke a serious financial situation. Its consequences cannot escape the notice of Admiral Bristol and it is more probable that he will propose as an alternative that, with a view to equalising the incidence of the consumption duties a duty should be also levied on coal which is now almost entirely a British import.

6. In any case, and in view of the deadlock which may ensue on the question of inflammable liquids, I should like to draw your Lordship's attention to certain aspects of the American position here.

7. The United States never declared war on Turkey, but merely broke off in 1917 relations which have never been resumed. In fact, Admiral Bristol continues to communicate with the Turkish Government through the Swedish Legation here. In point of law, therefore, the United States representative here has no *locus standi*

whichever in the civil administration of this city. The representatives of the three occupying Powers, namely the French High Commissioners and myself. The two former are particularly insistent on our duties and powers in this respect. They have maintained under their direct

remain directly subordinate to General Headquarters and not to the High Commission. All the *de facto* authority in this town—police, sanitation, customs, controls, &c.—is vested in the representatives. Nevertheless, so far as is compatible have endeavoured, in virtue of the world position of the United States, to associate their representative in all measures which they may consider it necessary to adopt.

8. It should, furthermore, be recollected that the present situation is not the outcome of any desire on the part of the three Allied Governments. They have been forced into it against their will and at very considerable expense. Yet Admiral Bristol, however, sharing in any way in the financial burden. This attitude appears to my Allied colleagues and to myself to be unreasonable, and it tends to make for friction.

9. It is also necessary to formulate the charge of unreasonableness which is

Admiral Bristol's attitude towards the American groups and firms are at this moment concessions in Anatolia and laying the basis for in this part of the world. It is therefore

when it is recollected that American

the American groups and firms are at this moment concessions in Anatolia and laying the basis for in this part of the world. It is therefore

when it is recollected that American

the American groups and firms are at this moment concessions in Anatolia and laying the basis for in this part of the world. It is therefore

I have, &c.
HOBART RUMBOLD.

Z 2026/5/44)

No. 61

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received March 20.)

(No. 255.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 18, 1922.

HAVING seen in the local press a statement to the effect that the Turkish Government had received several telegrams from Ismet Pasha, in one of which he had reported at length an interview he had had with your Lordship, I called on the Grand Vizier to-day with a view to ascertaining from his Highness what foundation there was for the statement in question. I also mentioned to his Highness the further statement in the press that the Council of Ministers had considered yesterday the results achieved by Ismet Pasha's Mission.

2. The Grand Vizier replied that beyond knowing that Ismet Pasha had reached the Turkish Government, he had no knowledge of the telegrams exchanged between the Turkish Government and their representatives in European capitals generally took three days in transmission. This caused great inconvenience. The Grand Vizier, who had seen the statement to which I alluded, said that it was an invention. I am not, however, quite satisfied that his explanation is correct as I know that the Turkish Government have received at least one telegram from Ismet Pasha.

3. In this connection, I learn from a good source that Ismet Pasha was at first unwilling to accept the Turkish Government's position. He was, however, brought round by the rational fact, though they are solid with Ankara with the Greek Government. The Central Government are also stated to be under the impression that the French Government are beginning to feel considerable embarrassment on account of the extreme claims of the Ankara Government. Ismet Pasha has, therefore, been instructed to act solely in the name of the Central Government.

4. From a Havre Reuter telegram from London, published in this morning's press, it would appear that Izzet Pasha is concerned to make out that the ideas of the Angora Government are much the same as his own, and that he will get into touch with Yussuf Kemal Bey as soon as the latter arrives in London. Izzet Pasha is reported as having expressed satisfaction with the conversation he had with your Lordship on the 9th instant.

5. In the course of further conversation, the *Grand Vizier* mentioned the *Grand Vizier* of a Venizelou movement in the Greek army in Asia Minor, and the *Grand Vizier* apprehensive of the consequences to the country if the evacuation by the Greek army were not regulated and supervised by Allied officers. It would *Grand Vizier* forces to replace the Greeks too quickly.

6. I listened to the *Grand Vizier's* remarks on this subject, but did not mention the Soviet Government for support. The *Grand Vizier* quoted in reply the Turkish proverb which says that, "A drowning man clutches at a serpent." I pointed out that the *Grand Vizier* had never been able to tolerate Bolshevik doctrine and had always been apprehensive of themselves too far with the Bolsheviks.

7. The *Grand Vizier* has recently been received at this High Commission in Constantinople. The Bolshevik representative who has been negotiating the *Grand Vizier* the Bolsheviks are making

8. In regard to the granting of concessions in Anatolia to Western powers, of the statements made by M. Mery as reported in my telegram No. 27th February, I learn from the British military authorities that the pay of the Kemalist army is in arrears and that this state of things can only be remedied by Bolshevik money. The Kemalists seem also to be having friction with the French regarding payment for arms supplied for the gendarmerie. Everything therefore points at present to some collaboration between Mustapha Kemal and the Bolsheviks.

9. The necessity for this collaboration has caused the Nationalists to relax their severity towards the Communists and to allow the "Yeni Dunya," the organ of the Communists, to continue its publication. On the other hand the *Grand Vizier* stated to-day that a certain Mukhtar Bey on his passage through Constantinople to join Yussuf Kemal Bey's Mission. Mukhtar Bey had informed the *Grand Vizier* that, with the exception of some twenty Communists, the National Assembly was loyal to the Government.

10. I kept out of the press the telegram from the Viceroy to His Majesty's Government endorsing the demands of Indian Moslems for the restoration of Anatolia and Eastern Thrace, including Adrianople, to Turkey, as I considered that this would lead to undesirable comment at this juncture. I have merely allowed the publication of Mr. Montagu's resignation without any indication of its causes.

11. I am forwarding a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister at Athens.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,

High Commissioner

E 3039 43 44]

No. 62

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received

March 20.)

(No. 288.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 14, 1922.

I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of an identic note from the *Grand Vizier* regarding the measures of coercion alleged by them to be contemplated by the Greek authorities with a view to compelling the Moslem populations of the occupied territories.

1. Though somewhat vague in character, the allegations appeared to me not inherently improbable, and I forwarded copies of this note to His Majesty's Minister at Athens and my representative at Smyrna for such observations as they might have to offer thereon.

1. I beg leave to forward to your Lordship copy of the reply which I have now received from Sir Harry Lamb, whose information generally appears to corroborate the charges of the Turkish Government in this respect.

4. I am forwarding a copy of this despatch and its enclosures by safe opportunity to Mr. Lindsey.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,

High Commissioner

Enclosure 1 in No. 62

Izzet Pasha to Sir H. Rumbold

Le 20 février 1922

Il est de la politique de la Turquie qui parviennent à la Sublime Porte de envisager l'apollution, dans les régions occupées, de la population musulmane à émigrer.

En conformité d'un projet arrêté à cet effet à Athènes et qui doit entrer en application au printemps prochain, il a été décidé de former des bataillons composés de Grecs arméniens dans le but de terroriser la population musulmane, d'augmenter les contributions de guerre, de déporter les hommes, et de réduire encore plus la faculté, déjà limitée, de travailler dans le pays.

Il est à noter que ces mesures sont prises avec rigueur et que la monnaie hellénique imposée. Enfin, les populations musulmanes.

D'autre part, il revient à la Sublime Porte de former des troupes composées de Grecs arméniens et d'Arméniens lesquelles sont appelées à agir contre les populations musulmanes.

Les renseignements démontrent que la Grèce, loin de renoncer à la politique de dévastation et d'extermination qu'elle poursuit dans les régions occupées, au dépit des règles du droit, et de l'humanité, ne vise qu'à achever le dépeuplement et la ruine de la population musulmane.

En conséquence, je prie de mon devoir de les dénoncer à votre Excellence.

Gouvernement afin de l'empêcher d'agir pour empêcher la mise en application des mesures dont il s'agit.

Je suis, agréé, &c.

///

enclosure 2 in No. 62

Consul-General Sir H. Lamb to Sir H. Rumbold.

(No. 43.)

Sir,

Smyrna, March 7, 1922

I HAVE had the honour to receive your Excellency's letter of the 25th ultimo, transmitting, for my observations, a copy of a note from the Sublime Porte, in which it is alleged that the Hellenic Government contemplates applying the area at present in their occupation, certain coercive measures calculated to compel the Moslem population to emigrate.

2. It is of course very difficult, if not impossible, for anyone not in the confidence of the Greek Government to be able to say whether or not they must inevitably be led to contemplate the measures indicated above was evident to anyone who has considered the meaning and effect of articles 72 and 83 of the Treaty of Sèvres, but, as regards

the specific statements contained in the Portes note, I can only offer the following remarks:

3. For many months past I believe that "civil volunteers" have been enrolled and armed in many of the towns of the interior for the avowed purpose of "supplementing the exiguous force of police and gendarmerie and assisting them in their task of order." I have heard of these volunteers accompanying detachments of troops in their frequent punitive expeditions against villages accused of harbouring brigands. In the course of my enquiries in regard to that incident, however, I have learned that they are accused (as stated in paragraph 3 of the telegram No. 14 of the 26th February and of my despatch No. 37 of the 1st March, in the first instance in which I have heard it stated that they had taken a leading part as brigandage bands, disguising themselves as Turks or Zeleks, to play the part of agents provocateurs. It is alleged by Turks here that the better organisation of these bands formed one of the matters which engaged the attention of M. Roussos during a lengthy visit which he paid to Smyrna during the winter. I do not, of course, wish to be taken as endorsing an accusation in support of which the only evidence is the statement of a single person. On the other hand, experience acquired in Macedonia unfortunately prevents me from dismissing it as incredible. In any case, I have it on the authority of well-informed Greeks themselves that the organisation of such bands on a large scale is contemplated in the event of a withdrawal, whether forced or voluntary, of their regular army. They would be composed of soldiers recruited in this district, reinforced by a certain number of Cretans, Macedonians or islanders.

4. The subject of requisitioning has been treated separately in various despatches. The burden has naturally fallen most heavily on the Turks, but the Orthodox Rhyas has not been unduly spared. Deportations have taken place on a considerable scale, the reason given being usually conspiracy against the established Government, or complicity in the action of Turkish bands.

5. I do not know to what the Porte alludes when it speaks of "contributions levied upon the population." I cannot say whether it is in contemplation to augment the number of "poines administratives," or to increase the amount of the "poine administrative."

6. No attempt is made here, so far as I am aware, to hinder the circulation of Turkish currency or to depreciate forcibly its exchange value. It is, however, conceivable that the military authorities may be imposing such measures in the area which is under exclusively military administration.

I attach an extra copy of this despatch in case your Excellency desires to transmit one to His Majesty's Minister at Athens, as I consider it preferable not to send him one through the ordinary post.

I have, &c.
HARRY H. LAMB

[E 3040/5/44] .

No. 83

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received March 20.)

No. 259.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 14, 1922.

I HAVE the honour to transmit the following translation of a communication of the "Anatolian Agency," which has been kept out of the local press by the Inter-Allied Press Censorship Commission, giving an account of declarations made to the Grand National Assembly by Jemal Bey, Commander of the Turkish forces in Europe.

1. "Angora, March 7.—In reply to questions at yesterday's session of the Grand National Assembly respecting the journey of Yussuf Kemal Bey, Commissioner for Foreign Affairs, and respecting his interview at Constantinople, Jemal Bey, Deputy Commissioner for Foreign Affairs, made certain statements. After the fall of the Cabinet of Damad Ferid Pasha, whose acts were prejudicial to the country, there came to power the Government of Tawfik Pasha. Izzet Pasha, though lacking in will and sagacity, wished, in virtue of his reputation, to play a part in connection with the life and independence of the country. With his colleagues, he facilitated the enemy's objects, and brought

about a cleavage in the feelings of the country. Izzet Pasha, who did not abstain from efforts to cause the dissolution of the struggle which we had started against the terms of the Treaty of Sevres, visited Anatolia to persuade us to accept that treaty. He explained both verbally and in writing that the Treaty of Sevres could not be modified even in the future, and endeavoured to incline Anatolia to his point of view.

Afterwards, Izzet Pasha's Mission agreed, as a result of discussions at Angora, that our policy was right and that they were in the wrong. They declared in writing in a document dated the 2nd March, 1921, that they shared our views, and that on their departure they would hand in their resignations and occupy themselves at Constantinople solely with their private affairs. Yet, after being allowed to go free on

undertakings. They shortly afterwards entered the Cabinet.

4. "Jemal Bey read the telegram sent by Izzet Pasha to Anatolia on his becoming Minister for Foreign Affairs on the eve of the Greek offensive, as well as the telegram sent in reply by his Excellency Mustapha Kemal Pasha. Izzet Pasha stated in his telegram that he had accepted the Ministry for Foreign Affairs on account of the gravity of the political situation, and on account of the danger which the disunity of the Allied Powers to aid Greece involved, especially for Constantinople, most being that for a few days a calmness had been apparent in European opinion, and that lately there

Smyrna had been discussed. In his reply of the 28th 21 Jemal Pasha informed him that the position was not in harmony with the undertaking which he had entered into along with Saib Pasha, reminding him of the Angora Convention, and expressed the fear that he had been deceived again. The Greek offensive, which occurred shortly afterwards, showed clearly how erroneous Izzet Pasha's observations were. In view of the constant political changes of the Government living in Constantinople in an atmosphere of slavery, tyranny and distress, Yussuf Kemal Bey last week on his passage through Constantinople invited these personages to return to their duty to their country and conscience and warned them to put themselves in the right and not to interfere with the lawful attitude and activities of the Grand National Assembly. Unfortunately, Yussuf Kemal Bey found himself exposed to a number of intrigues. The best proof of this is Izzet Pasha's visit to Europe.

5. "Another disgusting manoeuvre is Izzet Pasha's wishing to show that his journey is undertaken of his own initiative and after its necessity had been pointed out by foreign diplomatic circles, while it was undertaken only as a result of encouragement given by the Opposition. However, an interview of Yussuf Kemal Bey with a competent personage, alleged to have demonstrated the necessity of this journey, from expressing his surprise at the conduct of Izzet Pasha and his colleagues.

6. "Jemal Bey concluded his declaration thus:—

"Izzet Pasha is proceeding on his journey across Europe by rail, through the Greek flag. Yussuf Kemal Bey is also continuing his journey by sea without touching at the Piræus. This action of certain narrow and greedy politicians of the Government is proceeding resolutely and firmly towards the realisation of our object. We are proceeding resolutely and firmly towards the realisation of our sacred object will not have been in vain. I desire to declare once more from this seat that we are firmly resolved to reach our final goal, no matter what the sacrifice may be. Though we are exposed to tyranny, and the mothers, who have lost their children, are weeping bitter tears, history will register the end of a narrow, common, wretched, inconsistent and soulless group."

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD

High Commissioner.

Memorandum by Mr Rendel on Turkish Massacres and Persecutions of Minorities since the Armistice

THE conclusion of the armistice with Turkey on the 30th October, 1918, seems to have brought about a temporary cessation of the persecutions of the minorities by the Turks which had gone on all through the war. In the course of those persecutions, it is generally agreed that about 1 500 000 Armenians perished in circumstances of extreme barbarity, and that over 500 000 Greeks were deported, of whom comparatively few survived. The ghastly Armenian persecutions of the early part of the war formed the subject of a British Blue Book as early as 1916, and the almost equally horrible Greek persecutions have been dealt with in several Greek official publications (see particularly the proceedings of the third National Assembly in Athens in April 1921). Information regarding the persecutions of the other Christian bodies has not yet been collected.

2. It is necessary to refer to these pre-armistice persecutions, since there is now a strong tendency to minimise or overlook them, and to regard those which followed the armistice as isolated incidents provoked by the Greek landing at Smyrna and the general Turkish policy of the Allies.

1919

1. After the armistice the Allies, and in particular His Majesty's Government

ministers during the war, independently of what might be done under a final armistice. They principally aimed at securing: (1) the restoration of confiscated property (which entailed repatriation to Turkey of numerous refugees), (2) the recovery of Christian women and children in Moslem hands, and (3) the establishment of the responsibility for the war massacres.

4. During the first few months of 1919, when the military position of the Allies in Turkey was still unimpaired, and before the development of the Nationalist movement, the Turkish authorities co-operated in these objects, but, by September of that year, they had become frankly hostile and obstructive. As a result of Allied

to their homes in Cilicia, &c. (2) about 90 000 women and orphans were recovered from Moslem hands out of a total of about 170 000, and (3) certain notorious Turks were deported to Malta, whence, however, they were subsequently released.

Greeks all over Anatolia and Pontus began to come in.

6. On the 11th September, Lieutenant Slade (H.M.S. "Gardenia") reported that public security all along the Black Sea coast was very bad, that all the brigands and that 80 per cent. of the gendarmes were recruited from the brigands and devoted "most of their energies to rounding up odd Christians who were still at large."

7. On the 11th November, Admiral de Robeck reported as follows:

"The relief officers... find themselves met with obstructions and hostility. The most flagrant cases of injustice to Christians have to be left unredressed. The Christians are now bewildered and terrified

in the vicinity of Constantinople robbery under arms is of daily occurrence, the principal victims being naturally the unprotected Christians. All these elements of disorder stand Mustafa Kemal cannot, and will not, move a finger to help the Christians again taking possession of property restored to their Christian owners through the instrumentality of our relief officers, and a recent report shows that there

local authorities, to render it impossible for the Christians to earn their living, and, by boycotting and terrorism, to drive them again from their homes, never to return.

* The numerical numbers refer to the documents specified in the Annex.

8. On the 24th November a further report from Admiral de Robeck contained the following passage:

The methods which the Turks are employing to render life unendurable for their Christian fellow-countrymen are deserving of careful attention. His property is boycotted, his land crops made dangerous of access and farmed out to Moslems, who repudiate their engagements, and his houses and property ruined. It is consequently not a matter for surprise that the Greek and Armenian refugees are again leaving Asia Minor in increasing numbers.

And this statement was borne out and amplified by a detailed report, dated the 24th November, from the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, along the coast from Samson to Batoum.

9. On the 23rd December Admiral de Robeck wrote as follows to the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs: "It would appear that the system of persecution of Armenians by the Turks is definite and continuous: that movement is restricted, repair of their houses forbidden, robbery frequent, as well as threats. I am informed that, in spite of all this ill-treatment, the Armenians are proving most long-suffering, and are doing their utmost to prevent the recurrence of any unfortunate incidents." These representations, however, produced no result.

10. During November and December reports of increasing persecutions continued to reach His Majesty's High Commission in growing numbers, but it was not until the following year that the first really large scale massacres occurred.

1920

11. The first large scale massacre since the armistice, regarding which we have reliable information, is that which took place at Marash at the end of January. It appears to have been partly due to the fact that the French, who took over the town from the British in November 1919, on the one hand succeeded in giving the Turks the impression that Turkish sovereignty over it was to come, and on the other attempted to garrison the town with quite inadequate forces, largely consisting of Armenian levies.

12. Marash had a large Armenian population, which included considerable numbers of repatriated refugees and deportees.

13. The most vivid and detailed account of the Marash massacre is contained in the diary of Dr Crathern, the secretary of the American Y.M.C.A. Mission there. The massacre began on about the 23rd January. According to the British Divisional Intelligence Officer between 15 000 and 20 000 Armenians perished. Most of the women appear to have been killed with axes. Many of the women and children were subjected to horrible tortures before being killed. Dr Crathern's description of the scenes of "hellish cruelty" which he witnessed is difficult to forget.

14. On the 22nd March, Admiral de Robeck transmitted a document drawn up by Dr Kennedy, the representative of the "Lord Mayor's Fund" at Adana, containing the narratives of survivors of further massacres in the Ischlak and Marash districts. He added: "Their story shows that the proceedings lacked none of the ruthless and merciless brutality which hitherto have characterised Turkish outbreaks of massacre."

15. After the events at Marash, the French withdrew from their advanced positions in Cilicia, and, in spite of continued reports regarding the gravity of the situation, proved unable to give any further assistance.

and Antak. The Armenians at Hadjin decided to try to hold on in the hope of being saved by a general cotton-picking. The town fell, however, on the 15th October, and according to the report of a missionary from Adana, written a few days later, the Turks, on entering it, began a systematic destruction of both it and its inhabitants. All buildings were burnt and all fugitives from the flames were shot.

glasses, one could see that "not a house was left standing," and that the "whole ground was covered with dead bodies." The Armenian population of Hadjin at the time of the siege appears to have numbered about 9 000, of whom very few can have escaped.

16. The spring of 1920 also witnessed the outbreak of intensified persecutions

11 dating back as far as the spring of 1919 and covering almost every district in Asia Minor, have been received from Greek sources, and many are embodied in the minutes of the meetings of the Armenian Greek Section of the British High Commission at Constantinople but independent information about them is difficult to obtain, as there were few, if any, European relief workers or officials in the districts most particularly concerned. As early as the 9th February, however, Captain Perring R.N., had reported that the lack of public security for the Greeks and Armenians in the vilayet of Trebizond was very serious. The following is an extract from his report:

"A typical case is at Kavarna where a certain Ali Riza Bey carries out a vicious persecution, robs their cattle, burns their houses and makes them (the Christians) work for him without payment of any sort. This man terrorises the village to such an extent that the few local Christians dare not refuse. He is the leader of a well organised band of brigands. In general, the Greek villagers cannot circulate freely and are therefore obliged to sell their produce on the spot to Turkish merchants, who are thus able to buy at practically their own prices and realise large profits."

17 Later, the persecutions became worse and were frequently accompanied by actual massacres. It will perhaps be enough, however, to give the following extracts from two documents, the impartiality of which is above question:

18 The first is a report dated the 7th October, 1920, from a British officer, General Headquarters British Army of the East, to the British Consulate, Smyrna, regarding which had already been received from the Patriarchate.

From information in the hands of the Smyrna Division, which is confirmed by a previous report, the whole Greek population of Isnik has been massacred. Apparently the majority of the massacres took place at the end of August—the remainder of the population were killed before the Greeks took the town, i.e., at the end of September. The number of killed is said to be about 180 families, or about 400-500 men, women and children.

I myself was taken round to some of the places where the remains of the bodies lay. Lack of time prevented me from visiting every scene of the massacres. I was assured, however, by the Greek officers that there were other such places.

At the foot of the mountains east of Isnik about 300 yards outside the city wall is a large cave. In this the burnt and mangled bodies had been thrown. A few odd bodies lay about outside though it was difficult to judge very accurately owing to the state of decomposition. I should say there were at least 100 dead at this spot alone.

All the bodies I saw had been mutilated, apparently they had first had their hands and feet cut off after that they were either burnt alive in the cave or had their throats cut. I clearly recognised the bodies of women and children among them. Apart from the mutilated remains, odd bones which lay about proved conclusively that the bodies had been cut up.

Djema Bey is said to be responsible for these massacres. Many stories are in circulation regarding his outrages in the town.

The ancient Greek church at Isnik, which dates from 332 A.D. has been thoroughly smashed up, only the walls remaining. The images, carvings, &c., were all broken up and the church literature taken outside and burnt in a pile. It is said that a number of people were massacred inside the church.

The Greek soldiers, who have every opportunity of visiting these places, are not unnaturally bitterly enraged about it."

19 The second document is the White Paper containing the reports of the atrocities in the Yalova Gemlek and Isnik areas of March and April of that year. The Yalova Commission particularly mentions the destruction by the Kemalists in the Isnik area of the Armenian villages in the same district and the Isnik Commission begins its report with the statement that the number of atrocities in the Isnik Peninsula, and it appears that those on the part

of the Turks have been more considerable and ferocious than those on the part of the Greeks." The Isnik report further contains the following passage:

which had become less numerous since the summer of 1920, and even more so in June and July 1920 (when preparations were being made for Greek offensives).

Turkish bands of a more or less Kemalist persuasion are scouring the entire sanjak of Isnik as far as the environs of Scutari (Pashakem 20 kilom. east of Scutari).

As often as not, these bands are assisted by the Turkish inhabitants of adjoining villages. A large number of villages have thus been looted or burnt and their decimated population has been obliged to flee.

There should more particularly be mentioned the names of Yem-Kem south of Shileh, about a dozen villages in the region north and north east of Ada Bazar and some twelve villages in the region south of Ada Bazar amongst them the large village of Orta Kem, near Guevch (16,000 inhabitants), and several villages south and south-east of Isnik.

From July 1920 the Greek military occupation had restricted the operations of Turkish bands to the eastern and south-eastern part of the peninsula, but the region of Karamursel (south of the Gulf of Isnik) still constitutes an impervious Nationalist centre, from which various bands attack Greek villages in the neighbourhood aided by the population of Turkish villages.

Excuses committed by enemy bands are often given as a motive or as a pretext for these expeditions.

The latter became very numerous in the spring of 1921, and extended as far as the northern environs of Isnik bringing about the destruction of all the Christian villages in this region with the exception of Bugebeyik.

The Greek authorities have submitted a list of thirty-two villages looted or burnt, with more than 12,000 persons massacred, 2,500 missing, and the remainder of the population (more than 15,000) living as refugees at Isnik.

In view of the numerous witnesses examined by it, the Commission is of the opinion that these facts should be accepted as fundamentally true notwithstanding a certain amount of exaggeration in the figures.

151

20 The persecutions of 1921 were on a larger scale and more atrocious than those of 1920. The area affected is so great and the atrocities are so varied and continuous that it is difficult to select special cases for mention. Moreover the mass of documents at our disposal is now so enormous that any compression of the information contained in it into suitable limits has become well nigh impossible.

21 The Armenians suffered very badly in the interior of Cilicia and the story as pieced together by a Canadian missionary, of the gradual annihilation in June 1921 of the refugees who had attempted in the previous year to re-establish themselves in the ruins of Zaitoun, is one of the most horrible narratives of this period.

22 The massacres at Mersivan at the end of July, which formed the subject of an article in "The Times" of the 26th October 1921, were apparently due to the notorious Osman Aga, Mayor of Karasund, and a commandant in the Kemalist army, who is also responsible for a large number of the worst atrocities in the Pontine region. The brief "Times" account is confirmed and amplified by a memorandum which was drawn up by the Armenian Greek Section of the British High Commission at Constantinople and transmitted by Sir H. Rumbold on the 22nd October, and also by a much fuller entirely independent first-hand account written by Mr. Hosford, the American Near East Relief agent in Mersivan, transmitted to us by the United States Embassy on the 30th December last. Mr. Hosford's account which is extremely detailed and written in a calm and critical spirit, paints a picture of unrelieved horror.

23 It appears that as many of the Christians as possible were gathered into three buildings—the city prison, the French boys' school and a house called "the red house." Those gathered in the red house were mostly young girls, who were all violated. The houses were subsequently set on fire but after much difficulty most of the occupants were let out. The next day, Mr. Hosford says, Miss Anthony, of the American Near East Relief, was able to watch "the hauling out of wagon-loads of dead bodies and the burying of these bodies in pits across the valley from our house."

The Turks in our employ secured permission for one of these deportees of the fifth group to visit us. He told us not only of the robbing of his own group

() Total number of Greek men noted as passing under _____
I have no doubt it was _____
[8975]

part of the Greek male population (from 15 years to 50) had already gone to replace the Armenian gangs who had all died from neglect and want of food. These Greeks will all die also during the coming winter. The total number of Greek women passed and noted is 400. They are all young and their future fate and present suffering it is impossible adequately to describe.

33. In regard to the Armenian labour gangs referred to in the last paragraph it may be noted that Colonel Rawlinson told Sir H. Rumbold last November that during his captivity there were about 9,000 Armenians in these gangs in the neighbourhood of Erzeroum, of whom there were only 700 to 750 survivors left by the date of his departure. The latter were then about to be sent back to Erivan under the Treaty of Kars.

34. Further first-hand evidence of the Turkish atrocities in the Pontine region has lately been obtained from a somewhat unexpected quarter, namely a member of the recent Ukrainian Mission to Angora, by a British official in Russia. This man stated that on the mission's return journey, not far from Samsoun, they came across the remains of some Greeks—old men, women of all ages, and children. The girls had evidently been violated. He added that the Ukrainian mission lodged a protest on the subject, and that the Turkish official at Samsoun was very confused.

35. In conclusion it may be interesting to quote the opinion on the Nationalist Angora, to Sir H. Rumbold on the 6th January last, immediately after his departure from Angora. Signor Tuozzi stated that the deportations were continuous and that he saw numerous gangs of Christians forced into labour battalions going up into the interior. He regarded the outlook for these gangs as utterly hopeless. In his opinion the Nationalists hold a perfectly simple view of the minorities question. They regard the minorities as having been the cause of unending trouble in the past and have decided that the best way to prevent the recurrence of this trouble is to put an end to the existence of the minorities. They want Anatolia for the Turks, and Signor Tuozzi expressed the opinion that the evacuation of Smyrna and its district by the Greeks would be the death blow of the minorities in that region. He stated that the Nationalists would be perfectly prepared to subscribe to any arrangements made by the Allies for the protection of minorities, but that whatever these arrangements were, there would be no intention on the part of the Kemalists of ever seeing them fulfilled.

G. W. RENDEL

March 20, 1922

Annex

Authority for Statements contained in Memorandum

- Secretary of State's Memorandum on the Treaty of Sevres, December 10, 1921 p. 13 of table. Print 7465a.
2. Mr. Rattigan, Constantinople, No. 535, May 20, 1921, paragraph 2. E 6441 143/44.
 3. "The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-1916." "Miscellaneous No. 31 (1916)."
 4. "Anti Greek Persecutions in Turkey, 1908-1921." London, Vallonis, 1921. Transmitted by Greek Legation, November 17, 1921. E 12670 143/44.
 5. "Turkey Annual Report for 1920," paragraph 159.
 6. "Turkey Annual Report for 1920," paragraph 160.
 7. Admiral Webb, Constantinople, No. 1676, September 11, 1919. Eastern Vol., Part II, No. 110.
 8. Compare Mr. Harmsworth's note on Mr. A. Williams's parliamentary question of December 16, 1921. E 13873, 800/44.
 9. League of Nations memorandum, dated August 31, communicated to Foreign Office September 3, 1921. E 10119, 1623/44.
 10. "Turkey Annual Report for 1920," paragraph 160.
 11. Admiral de Robeck, Constantinople, No. 2110, November 11, 1919. Eastern Vol., Part II, No. 165.
 12. Admiral de Robeck, No. 2203, November 24, 1919. Eastern Vol., Part II, No. 181.

13. Admiral de Robeck, No. 2420, December 27, 1919. E 170747/44/20.
14. M. de Robeck, No. 2420, December 27, 1919. E 170747/44/20.
15. Admiral de Robeck, No. 2246, December 4, 1919. Eastern Vol., Part II, No. 193.
16. Admiral de Robeck, No. 2246, December 4, 1919. Eastern Vol., Part II, No. 193.
17. Admiral de Robeck, No. 2246, December 4, 1919. Eastern Vol., Part II, No. 193.
18. Admiral de Robeck, No. 305, March 22, 1920. Eastern Vol., Part IV, No. 162.
19. Admiral de Robeck, No. 303, March 2, 1920. Eastern Vol., Part IV, No. 126.
20. Lord Derby, Paris, Tel. No. 377, March 20, 1920. Eastern Vol., Part IV, No. 148.
21. Admiral Webb, Constantinople, Tel. No. 413, April 16, 1920. Eastern Vol., Part IV, No. 181.
22. Admiral Webb, Tel. No. 421, April 20, 1920. Eastern Vol., Part IV, No. 185.
23. M. de Robeck, No. 101, November 1, 1920. E 13534, 1214/44.
24. Telegram of November 1, 1920, and Foreign Office telegram to Paris, No. 1188 of November 4, 1920. E 13534, 1214/44.
25. Mr. Satow Beirut, No. 96, July 15, 1921. E 8823, 800/44.
26. Admiral de Robeck, No. 205, February 27, 1920. E 1765, 1340/44.
27. Admiral de Robeck, No. 1443, October 21, 1920. E 13849, 1340/44.
28. "Reports on the Atrocities in the District of Yalova &c." (1920).
29. Sir H. Rumbold, Constantinople, No. 709, August 17, 1921. E 11678, 143/44.
30. Sir H. Rumbold, Constantinople, No. 709, August 17, 1921. E 11678, 143/44.
31. United States Embassy, No. 346, December 30, 1921. E 14309, 143/44 (1921). (This contains numerous and important communications from American consular workers, &c. obtained through the State Department at Washington.)
- 32, 33. See minutes of meetings of Armenian-Greek Section of British High Commission at Constantinople during the year 1921.
34. Sir H. Rumbold, No. 1091, November 30, 1921. E 13333, 340/44.
35. Colonial Office, July 9 and September 19, 1921. E 7013 and E 10548, 43/93.
36. "Turkey Annual Report for 1920," paragraph 153.
37. Sir H. Rumbold, No. 949, October 15, 1921. E 11678, 143/44.
38. Telegram of July 23, 1921. E 8532/143/44. (This telegram gives very detailed statistics by villages, but the source is Greek.)
39. Dr. Kennedy to Sir Eric Drummond, November 20, communicated by Mr. A. Williams, November 22, 1921. E 13345, 143/44.
40. Sir H. Rumbold, Tel. No. 749, November 24, 1921. E 12656, 143/44.
41. Mr. Rattigan, Constantinople, No. 715, July 27, 1921. E 8784, 143/44.
42. Sir H. Rumbold, No. 1001, September 28, 1921. E 13807, 340/44.
43. War Office, M 12, November 23, 1921. E 12840, 143/44. (This is the original.)
44. Sir H. Rumbold, Tel. No. 738, November 21, 1921. E 12765, 143/44.
45. Mr. Grove, Moscow, to Mr. Gregory, February 17, 1922. E 2345, 143/44.
46. Sir H. Rumbold, Tel. No. 3, January 6, 1922. E 13005, 143/44.

March 20, 1922

G. W. R.

E 3775 900 44]

No. 65

Count de Salis to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received March 20, 1922.)

No. 10
My Lord,

Rome, March 9, 1922.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's copy of the note addressed to the Cardinal Secretary of State relative to the French proposal of the 11th March 1922, and to inform you that the Vatican officially of the agreement concluded at San Remo on the 24th April 1922.

In reply, Cardinal Gasparri has addressed to me a note, copy and translation of which I have the honour to forward to you.

Yours faithfully,
G. W. R.

which are herewith enclosed, in which he recapitulates the situation as far as the Holy See is concerned. The French protectorate is founded on the Capitulations between France and the Holy See, and on the order given to the clergy by the Holy See that for the protection of their interests they should address themselves to the French representative. To support the prestige of the protecting Power, certain liturgical privileges were granted as an accessory to the protectorate. Where Turkish domination has ceased, the Capitulations have ceased and consequently the French protectorate and its accessories, unless these should be continued by the Holy See in gratitude for the services rendered in the past. Putting aside for the moment the question of French renunciation of the protectorate, it would follow that in territory still under the Sultan, the protectorate and its accessories still continue. In territory definitely taken away from the Sultan (Bulgaria, Serbia, &c.), it has ceased, unless the Capitulations have been replaced by special agreements between France and the local Power. With the protectorate the liturgical honours also ceased. Finally, in

the protectorate still continues *de jure*, though *de facto* all that is left of it are the honours, since the governing Power which is in the place of the Sultan could not admit the intervention of the French representative in matters concerning other than French interests. As regards the French renunciation, Cardinal Gasparri goes so far as to say that if France has really given up the protectorate and the honours, any doubt about them is definitely settled since it is not admissible that France should withdraw from the Holy See while renouncing them as regards other Powers. But, Britain and Italy declare that France has given up both protectorate and honours. France denies that she has done so, and the Holy See, which was not at San Remo, is not in a position to decide. It is therefore necessary for the British Government to solve the following question: At the meeting of San Remo did France give up the protectorate in the East, including the liturgical honours? If His Majesty's Government will communicate to Cardinal Gasparri the result of the controversy on this point, the Holy See will give the necessary instructions to the authorities of the Catholic Church in the East.

As your Lordship will observe, the earlier part of the note is a recapitulation of the note of the 12th April, 1918 (enclosed in my despatch No 39 of the 22nd April, 1918), which at the same time related the circumstances in which the Vatican had cancelled their original orders to the effect that the honours at Jerusalem should cease, and that the honours till the conclusion of peace and that his attitude was approved by the British and Italian Governments.

I have, &c.
J. DE SALIS

Enclosure in No. 65.

Vatican Note of March 6, 1922

(Translation.)

THE undersigned Cardinal Secretary of State of His Holiness hastens to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's note of the 14th February relative to an incident which occurred at Constantinople on the occasion of the funeral solemnities for the August Pontiff Benedict XV, at which the French High Commissioner, in accordance with the instructions of his Government, claimed and obtained a place of distinction as representative of France, protecting Power of Catholics in the East.

Your Excellency states that at the meeting at San Remo of the 24th April, 1920, France renounced her protectorate in the East, it being agreed that none of the three Great Powers present at the meeting, England, France and Italy, would exercise such right of protectorate in future. On behalf of Lord Curzon your Excellency informed the Holy See of that agreement, expressing the hope that the Holy See would give appropriate instructions to all the authorities of the Catholic Church, whereby the repetition of similar regrettable incidents might be avoided.

In reply to this note the undersigned Cardinal thinks it will be opportune if he briefly describes the nature and scope of the French protectorate, and he allows himself the hope that this explanation will not be unwelcome to the British Government.

The French protectorate in the East is the privilege which France has enjoyed of

rite, and by force of custom also of those of the Oriental rite. Its juridical basis is twofold:

- (a.) The Capitulations obtained from the Sublime Porte, which had the force of international treaties and which conferred on France the right of protection.
- (b.) The order given by the Holy See to the regular and secular clergy to address themselves for the protection of their interests to the French representative, in preference even to the representative of the local Power. This order, though it did not confer the right obtained by France through the Capitulations, had nevertheless had practical application, inasmuch as many other Powers had obtained Capitulations with the Ottoman Empire, and also because, in virtue of the law of nations, can intervene in defence of its own national rights.

In addition the Holy See, in order to keep up the prestige of the protecting Power, had granted to the representatives of France in the East certain

liturgical honours were necessary to the protectorate and were given by the Holy See without the intervention of any Power. The privilege, therefore, of protecting Catholics as against the Ottoman authorities, with the enjoyment as an accessory of these liturgical honours, constitutes the French protectorate in the East.

From the foregoing it is clear that once the Turkish domination ceases in any part of the East the Capitulations with France cease also, and with them the French protectorate which was based on them. The liturgical honours, necessary to the protectorate, likewise cease according to the juridical maxim, *accessorium sequitur principalem*, unless the Holy See should wish that these honours be continued as a point of gratitude for the protection afforded to Catholics in times past. It is clear that the Ottoman Government in the beginning of the war denounced the Capitulations as a violation of an international pact, and that they have no juridical value without the consent of the other contracting party in the present case France.

As regards the renunciation by France, about which we shall speak later, we must first state the above-mentioned principles, have the following. In the first place, the honours still *de jure* belong to the Sultan and *de facto* are still under his authority, Constantinople, the French protectorate as well as the honours still remain. In territories definitely withdrawn both *de jure* and *de facto* from the Sultan's authority, such as Bulgaria, Serbia, &c., the French protectorate has ceased, unless there are particular agreements between France and the local Power taking the place of the Capitulations, and with the protectorate the liturgical honours have also ceased. On the other hand, in the territories taken from Turkey by the Treaty of Sevres, which is not yet ratified, the protectorate remains.

Where the state of war continues juridically, and therefore juridically the principle applies, *durante bello nihil innovatur*.

It has been said above that "the protectorate remains *de jure*, or at least the liturgical honours remain," because *de facto*, the Power which governs in place of the Sultan will certainly not admit the intervention of the French representative in disputes between non-French subjects and the local authorities; therefore the question is reduced to the liturgical honours alone, and it was, by applying the principle of *durante bello nihil innovatur*, that the Holy See, at the beginning of the war, was aware, the question of the liturgical honours in Jerusalem at the beginning of the war.

We now come to the renunciation by France at the conference of San Remo. It is clear that, on the same footing as the other Powers, the whole question must be held to be settled, and France could not claim such honours from the Holy See because it would be inadmissible that she should renounce them to other Powers and claim them from the Holy See. While, however, the British Government, as stated in your Excellency's note, and the Italian Government affirm that both the protectorate and the liturgical honours are renounced, the French Government affirms the contrary, and it is impossible for the Holy See, which was not present at the meeting of San Remo, to make any pronouncement in this dispute.

In these circumstances it is necessary that the British Government should settle diplomatically with the French Government the following question: At the meeting

of San Remo did France renounce her protectorate in the East, not excluding the liturgical honours?

If eventually the Government of His Britannic Majesty will be so good as to communicate to the undersigned Cardinal the result of this diplomatic discussion, the Holy See will not fail to give the necessary instructions to the authorities of the Catholic Church in the East.

The undersigned Cardinal avails himself, &c.

P. CARD. GASPARRI

E 3274 5, 44,

No. 66

Minutes of the First Meeting of Foreign Ministers at the Quai d'Orsay
March 22, 1922.—(Held at Foreign Office, March 25)

Present—

For France	M. Poincaré, M. de Perrotti de la Roche, M. Burgeton
For Great Britain	Marquess Curzon of Kedleston, Mr R. G. Vansittart, Mr J. G. G. Forster
For Italy	Signor Schanzer, Marquis Visconti-Venosta, Signor Guariglia

Interpreter, M. Camerlynck

There were also present for the discussion of the armistice proposals

M. ...	General Sir C. Harrington
...	Colonel Heywood
General Weygand	General Mariotti

M. Poincaré began by asking Lord Curzon to open the proceedings.

Communications to the Press

Lord Curzon said that he wished first to ask M. Poincaré and Signor Schanzer that no communications should be made to the press except such as might be agreed at the end of each meeting.

M. Poincaré and Signor Schanzer both agreed.

Armistice

Lord Curzon then referred to the proposal for an armistice between the belligerents in Asia Minor, which he had already mentioned to his French and Italian colleagues, and as a personal proposal of his own to the two Turkish delegations in London. The moment seemed favourable; there had been no serious incident since the evacuation of the Greek zone in the summer in front of Adana, Karahisar-Eskisehir. The Greeks had already placed themselves in the hands of the Allies. If the evacuation of Asia Minor, on which, subject to a satisfactory general settlement, there was general agreement, was to be peaceably carried out, there must be first an immediate cessation of hostilities and then a retirement of the Greek forces in successive stages (the Greek press spoke of this taking eight months—the Allied generals at Constantinople seemed to

be of the opinion that it would take a year). It was an essential step towards a general peace. The Greeks would require security that in retiring they were not going to be molested. The Turks should realise that they were going to secure the object of their campaign in Asia Minor without a renewal of hostilities. The only object of the Allies was to be impartial towards Greece and Turkey and to secure a peace as soon as possible. Nothing could be more unfortunate than a renewal of hostilities.

Lord Curzon therefore suggested that an identical telegram should be sent both to Constantinople and Angora and to Athens, and he submitted a draft (see Annex I to these minutes).

Lord Curzon drew particular attention to the armistice clause in his draft which stipulated that no movement of troops to or from the theatre of war should take place. This would apply to both parties, but was more important to the Turks than to the Greeks. If the Turks refused the armistice terms, the Greeks, feeling that they must eventually evacuate, but uncertain as to the date, might rush their troops to the sea, ship them to Thrace, thus consolidating their position there and possibly threatening Constantinople, should the Allies show signs of retreating. This would be precluded by the clause preventing the movement of troops.

Lord Curzon also raised the question of the period of the armistice. His military advisers had suggested ninety-two days; Lord Curzon thought this was perhaps too long and that six weeks might be sufficient, but he would be particularly glad to hear the views of M. Poincaré and Signor Schanzer on the subject.

M. Poincaré had expressed doubts to him as to whether the Turks would accept an armistice, Lord Curzon was equally doubtful about the Greeks. Much would depend upon the advice given by M. Poincaré to the Turks with which he was in closer contact than Lord Curzon, and on the advice to be given by Lord Curzon to the Greeks. Lord Curzon put forward the proposal in any case as in his opinion the first essential step towards peace. Without an armistice the work which the Allies were undertaking might be destroyed at any moment.

M. Poincaré said that he had already briefly expressed his point of view to Lord Curzon that morning. He was afraid that the Turks would not accept an armistice proposed by other Powers than Greece. In any case, he feared that the draft proposed would be unacceptable to the Turks that Anatolia was to be evacuated. It was essential that the three countries should not court a refusal, and he therefore suggested that the draft should be amended to cover this particular point.

Signor Schanzer said that he thought M. Poincaré was merely making a distinction between the principle of the armistice and its details. He was prepared to accept the principle, subject to further discussion of details.

Lord Curzon, referring to M. Poincaré's doubts as to the Turkish acceptance of the armistice, pointed out that the Allies should not be guided in their attitude by their own fears. They had already met with refusal in dealing with this question in the past. They might have more in front of them, but the responsibility for the peace of Europe and of the world rested on their shoulders, and they must take risks in doing what they thought right. If the Greeks accepted the armistice and the Turks refused, the latter would lose in the eyes of the world, and would find the attainment of a satisfactory peace ultimately more difficult in consequence. Lord Curzon was, however, prepared to meet M. Poincaré's criticism regarding the evacuation of Anatolia by the Greeks. He would first point out, however, that the Turks already know perfectly well from their conversations with Lord Curzon in London that an armistice was intended to be preliminary to a peaceful evacuation of Anatolia by the Greeks. He therefore suggested that something like the following should be inserted in the preamble to the British proposal.

In transmitting their proposals to the Governments concerned, the three Ministers make the following proposal with a view to enable them to make recommendations for the peaceful evacuation of Asia Minor.

Such a formula would go a long way to show the main objects of the Allies. He trusted that with that addition M. Poincaré might be able to give his support to the proposal as a whole. Indeed, M. Poincaré had given the British Ambassador in Paris to believe that he favoured the principle of an armistice when first proposed by Lord Curzon. It was also known that the British Ambassador in Paris had communicated the proposal to the French Foreign Ministers and that France alone should raise objection to it.

M. Poincaré said that it was quite true that he had told Lord Hardinge not only that he accepted an armistice in principle, but that he would tell the Turkish delegation so semi-officially. He was in agreement with Lord Curzon and Signor

Schanzer on the question of principle; it was only a matter of form. He accepted the addition proposed by Lord Curzon.

Lord Curzon raised the question whether the reference to the evacuation of Asia Minor should be made in the preamble or in the form of a communication *verbale*.

M. Poincaré thought the latter would be difficult of execution, especially in the case of Angora, and that it should be made in writing.

Lord Curzon then proposed the following formula:

"The Foreign Ministers of the three Great Powers assembled at Paris with a view to re-establish the peace of the Near East and to be in a position to make recommendations for the evacuation of Asia Minor without further destruction of life and property feel it to be their first duty to propose an armistice."

"The terms of the proposed armistice might be as follows:—"(For the rest of the proposal, see Annex I.)

M. Poincaré suggested a change to the words "with a view to secure the"

Lord Curzon pointed out that a number of points had to be decided before so definite a statement as to evacuation could be made.

M. Poincaré then suggested that the word "propose" before the words "an immediate suspension of hostilities" should be strengthened, and the words "strongly to recommend" were agreed upon.

M. Poincaré raised an objection to the word "immediate" as likely to "foster" the extreme demands of the Greeks.

Lord Curzon pointed out that it was essential to secure an armistice at once, that the formula had already been modified to meet the Angora point of view, and that to forestall delay and bargaining by Turkey the Allies ought to say firmly what they meant to say.

M. Poincaré said that he was only anxious to secure the success of Lord Curzon's proposal. He was afraid that the French Government had not the influence on the Turkish Government which Lord Curzon had suggested at earlier stage, whatever influence Lord Curzon might be able to bring to bear on the Greeks. He then waived his point.

[The Allied military experts then entered.]

Lord Curzon proposed that the military experts should examine the precise terms of the armistice attached to his proposal, but before they did so it would be necessary to discuss further the duration of the armistice period, as to which his colleagues had not expressed an opinion.

Signor Schanzer suggested that ninety-two days was not long enough.

M. Poincaré raised the question of procedure. It would be necessary, first, to discuss the essential conditions of peace; secondly, to work them out at Constantinople. This would take a long time.

Lord Curzon pointed out that it would not be possible to begin the evacuation of Asia Minor until the Greeks and Turks had agreed to the general conditions upon which it was to take place. The Constantinople Conference which was to elaborate the latter should therefore be held as soon as possible after the present meeting of the three Foreign Ministers.

General Weygand suggested that a long period would in these circumstances be

M. Poincaré said that it was important not to confuse the period of the armistice and the period of peace conditions. He himself thought that the procedure at Versailles had been a mistake, and that it would have been better to have had an armistice, a preliminary treaty of peace and a final treaty as after the war of 1870. In the present case the period of the armistice should be long enough to enable evacuation to take place during it and before the final treaty was made.

Lord Curzon agreed with M. Poincaré as to the three stages. There should

acceptance of which by both parties evacuation could begin. These would be elaborated at Constantinople and the final peace treaty completed by a sitting of the Supreme Council.

Signor Schanzer and Signor Schanzer agreed.

The experts then retired to discuss the terms of the armistice.

M. Poincaré observed that the telegram should be sent off as soon as possible, as time would have to be given for Mustapha Kemal to obtain the assent of the Grand National Assembly.

Tripartite Agreement and Italy.

Signor Schanzer asked that he might at this point make a declaration regarding

as possible and a cessation of the Greek Turkish hostilities, but vital Italian interests were at stake. Italy had been promised the maintenance of the equilibrium between the three Allies in the Mediterranean by article 9 of the Treaty of London, the agreement of St. Jean de Maurin, and the giving Italy a zone in Anatolia including Smyrna. The

of the Treaty of Sevres (particularly article 239) enabled the Tripartite Agreement to be applied. If the financial clauses were modified in particular, if the Financial Commission were not given a real control over concessions, Italy, with a new and more independent Turkey, would find herself in a worse economic position in Turkey than before the war. Italy must therefore insist that the Allies should require Turkey to accept such a control over concessions in the new treaty. Just as France insisted on Turkey providing from other revenues for any deficit in the existing revenues assigned to the service of the pre-war debt and just as British experts are understood to want a financial control over Turkey for the payment of war debts, so Italy must insist on a control over concessions without being intrinsically as to its consequences. The date of the

Signor Schanzer then proposed a formula (see Annex 3) to take the place of article 239 of the Treaty of Sevres, and asked that the Allies should accept it as a preliminary to any further discussion. Without satisfaction on this vital point he could not defend his Government's position before the Italian Parliament.

M. Poincaré appreciated Signor Schanzer's argument, but thought it would be impossible to reach the desired object of the Conference if at this stage each Ally was to press its own particular national interest. For the rest, Signor Schanzer overrated the extent to which France was benefiting from the Turkish settlement. All the Allies had been disabused by the course of events in Turkey. Northern Syria, and in particular Aleppo and Alexandretta, were in desperate straits owing to the war in Cilicia and the Kemalist attitude. In any case it was necessary to examine the essential question first, especially the stoppage of war in Anatolia. Each Government would reserve its final acceptance of the revised terms as a whole until they were ready for signature.

Signor Schanzer said that the mandates received by France and Great Britain were a real advantage. Italy had no counter benefit, and Italian public opinion insisted upon the Allies securing such for Italy. They must give her the practical application of economic priority under the Tripartite Agreement in her zone.

Lord Curzon sympathized with Signor Schanzer's position, but the Conference could not invert their order of procedure. He was about to propose that plans for the evacuation of Asia Minor should be discussed by the military experts, and that the Conference should then proceed to discuss other vital questions in the settlement, e.g., the future administration of Smyrna, the Straits, &c. The powers and functions of the Financial Commission would have to be exhaustively considered by experts in the first instance.

Signor Schanzer said that the Conference should be specially designed to satisfy French and Italian commercial interests, was an

England, as a matter of fact, asked for no zone), not an agreement with Turkey as a matter of fact, Turkey would not accept the application of the Tripartite Agreement in the way proposed under the Sevres settlement, and its essence must be obtained in another way. This was first a matter for the experts, who could sit at once while the conference continued, and the Italian case would be taken up at a later stage. Lord Curzon trusted that Signor Schanzer would collaborate on these conditions in the solution of the more vital questions before the conference. It was clear that neither France nor Great Britain had gained from the Turkish settlement. Both were finding their mandates burdens to which, in the case of the British mandates, Italy was welcome.

M. Poincaré desired to reserve France's attitude towards the question of the Dohat Council and the financial clauses for which technical preparation was necessary. Both France and Great Britain, however, were ready to accept the Tripartite Treaty as between the three Powers as in complete force, and to apply it as loyally as possible, but the form of application must be made acceptable to Turkey.

Signor Schanzer urged that the question was not technical but vital for Italy, so could not be deferred. His formula did not touch the sovereignty of Turkey.

M. Poincaré pointed out that the formula made the Financial Commission permanent because the control was to be permanent. His own idea was that it should be temporary, and not be merged in the

Lord Curzon again pointed out that Signor Schanzer was endeavouring to reverse the usual procedure of all previous conferences. He quite valued Signor Schanzer's point that the application of the Tripartite Agreement was of prime political importance to Italy but its application must in the first place be decided by the experts. Incidentally the formula proposed by Signor Schanzer went much further than the mere application of the Tripartite Agreement. It ought to control the grant of Turkey, not only in the French and Italian zone. While it was essential that their deliberations should not be suspended while it was being considered, Lord Curzon declared himself ready to assure Signor Schanzer that he would do his best to obtain for Italy the substance of the Tripartite Agreement in the new treaty.

Signor Schanzer trusted that Lord Curzon's declaration might be interpreted in the sense that Italy would be satisfied in the way which she desired. For the rest, he did not ask, for the present, more than that his formula should be submitted at once to the experts, although he must make all reservations as to Italy's satisfaction on this point being subordinated to her acceptance of the treaty as a whole.

Evacuation of Anatolia.

Lord Curzon proposed that the detailed plan, with maps prepared by the Allied Generals at Constantinople, for the evacuation of Anatolia should be at once examined by the Versailles Committee under Marshal Foch. Evacuation would involve acceptance and collaboration by the Greeks and abstention by the Turks. Cordial co-operation of the Allied military authorities and the presence of officers of the three countries would be essential for this difficult task.

Armistice Proposals.

The armistice proposals as redrafted by the experts (see Annex 3 for final text.)

M. Poincaré and Marshal Foch suggested that the functions of the central commission and sub-commission in article 4 should be extended to look after the local population, and prevent pillage and massacre, &c., in which the Greeks might indulge as a prelude to evacuation.

Lord Curzon pointed out that there were two distinct questions—the armistice on the existing line, with a special commission to see to its execution, and in which perhaps the Armistice Commission might merge. The Armistice Com-

mission should not assume large responsibilities over a wide area. Incidents of the kind feared by Marshal Foch were unlikely in any case to occur.

It was finally agreed to meet Marshal Foch's point by the addition of reference to article 4 (see text as finally agreed upon in Annex 3). After some discussion the word "arbitrage" was accepted instead of "decisions" in article 5 as more palatable to both Turks and Greeks. The text was then accepted.

Question of Communication to Greeks and Turks.

M. Poincaré suggested that the armistice proposal should be communicated at once to the representatives of the two Turkish Governments and to the Greek Government through their respective official representatives in Paris. None of the Allies had representatives at Angora. France had not sent one as the agreement of October with Angora was in no sense a treaty of peace.

Lord Curzon said that on previous occasions, such as that of a joint communication by the Supreme Council to the Dutch Government regarding the exiles of Germany, the President of the conference telegraphed the decision to his Minister in the country, whose Government was being addressed, and instructions were sent to the other two Ministers to make a collective representation.

M. Poincaré pointed out that this was not a meeting of the Supreme Council, but only an informal meeting of Foreign Ministers. There was no formal chairman.

It was finally agreed that the proposal should be signed by the three Foreign Ministers and communicated to the Turkish Governments at Constantinople. The British and Italian delegations would telegraph the text to their representatives, with instructions to make a joint communication. It was also agreed to communicate the text of the proposal at once to the press.

Smyrna.

Lord Curzon then raised the question of the future régime at Smyrna after evacuation had taken place. Before discussing possible alternative forms of régime, it was necessary to decide whether Turkey was to be allowed to return to unfettered control over the Smyrna area, or whether some safeguards after the return of Turkish sovereignty would be required. Lord Curzon thought that the former course was unacceptable. The French Government in their proposals of 1918, on the lines of Alexandria, but the latter was primarily designed to give representation to the foreign commercial interest. In the case of Smyrna it was not only a question of the interests of merchants in the town, but of the protection of the population of a large locality. There were some 100,000 Greeks in Smyrna, some 40,000 in Aivali, some 60,000 in the Tcheoue Peninsula. In the whole Smyrna zone, according to pre-war American figures, there were some 500,000 Greeks. Possibly not all the population had yet been repatriated, but if the Turks returned victorious, what was to be done for this large population and the safety of life and property? Would guarantees for

suffice? Lord Curzon thought clearly not. It would be desirable, in his opinion, to establish some special form of safeguard for the area, either on the lines of the Near East Commission, as he had proposed in his note of December last to the French and Italian Governments, but which he was now inclined to consider unsuitable, or possibly a lesser régime on Lebanon lines. Perhaps even an entirely new proposal should be examined, e.g., a Turkish vali with a special council on which there would be foreign representation, which the Turks might prefer to that of the local elements alone. In any case, whatever geographical area was selected, Lord Curzon proposed some form of administration, which, while prejudicing Turkish sovereignty as little as possible, would yet afford some real protection to the non-Turkish population. A scheme might be worked out by experts once the principle was accepted. Public opinion in England would find it very difficult to accept the return of this area with only the safeguards of the European minority treaties.

M. Poincaré replied that French public opinion did not want any special favours to be shown to the Greeks. Why should there be one kind of special

regime for them and not for the Kurds, Armenians, &c. He thought it was impossible to impose any special regime on Turkey if proposed either for the level of the Smyrna zone. Turks were in a state of violent patriotic and if any proposal was made touching their sovereignty in Asia it would be rejected. Moreover, it was doubtful if the Greeks of Smyrna were really the enemy of the Turk. They were reported to desire urgently the evacuation of Asia Minor by Greece. If any special administration was to be applied to this area, it was better to restrict it to the smallest possible area - the town of Smyrna.

With difficulties with the Turks probably for any larger area than the town.

It was pointed out that he had never suggested a special regime for the town of Smyrna, but that at any rate in the case of Smyrna to-day in the whole Smyrna zone, the Greeks were in a majority. It was against recognising a national majority here was not accepted elsewhere. It was based there case for keeping parts of the eastern vilayets and for Greece and Adrianople on the Turkish majority in each instance. Yusuf Kemal had told Lord Curzon that he was ready to give up any territory where there was a majority. Why should there be a special regime around Smyrna in which there was a Greek majority?

Lord Curzon thought, however, that the best procedure might be to discuss the question of Smyrna again later in connection with the general question of the evacuation of Asia Minor. At the moment it was essential to bring in to the greatest possible extent the League of Nations.

M. Poincaré presumed that if Adrianople remained Greek and Smyrna were left to Turkey, the regime to be applied to Smyrna would be applied to Adrianople. Special guarantees would no doubt be required for any compact bodies of Greek or Armenian populations that might be scattered through Asia Minor. In Smyrna, he still favoured a regime for the town only, but he accepted the general procedure as to further discussion of the question proposed by Lord Curzon.

Proceedings

Signor Schanzer reverted to the question of communications to the press. He hoped it might be possible for each delegation to have some latitude in speaking to the press, apart from the agreed communications of the conference.

Both M. Poincaré and Lord Curzon deprecated the suggestion, which would probably only lead to one-sided accounts of the day's proceedings being given by each delegation.

(The meeting then adjourned.)

ANNEX I

The Governments of Great Britain, France, and Italy

Being desirous, in order to facilitate negotiations for the re-establishment of peace in the East, to ensure an immediate cessation of hostilities between the Greek and Turkish military forces in Anatolia

Have agreed to propose the following terms for an armistice to be signed by the commanders of the said Greek and Turkish military forces

1. Hostilities will cease at twenty-four hours in the night of 22 March 1922.
2. Hellenic and Turkish outposts will be withdrawn in accordance with the decisions of local commissions, consisting of representatives of the local Turkish and Greek commanders and Allied officers, wherever there is contact between the two armies, the guiding principle being to break contact as far as possible, in order to avoid incidents occurring between members of the two armies.
3. No movement of troops to or from the theatre of war in Anatolia is to take place.
4. Allied commissions to be appointed to both armies as guarantee to either side that the terms of this armistice are respected.

5. Hostilities will be suspended for a period of ninety-two days, renewable automatically for periods of ninety-two days until such time as a peace treaty shall come into force. Should either party wish to denounce this convention, it will be bound to give notice of its intention to the other party and the representatives of Great Britain, France and Italy a clear fortnight before the expiration of one of these periods.

ANNEX

Le Conseil de la Dette avant d'émettre son avis devra examiner si les conditions de ces contrats sont conformes aux intérêts du Gouvernement ottoman. Le tout au vu de la loi n° 1101 du 22 mars 1922.

Le Conseil de la Dette avant d'émettre son avis devra examiner si les conditions de ces contrats sont conformes aux intérêts du Gouvernement ottoman. Le tout au vu de la loi n° 1101 du 22 mars 1922.

Le Conseil de la Dette avant d'émettre son avis devra examiner si les conditions de ces contrats sont conformes aux intérêts du Gouvernement ottoman. Le tout au vu de la loi n° 1101 du 22 mars 1922.

ANNEX 2

Le 22 mars 1922
Ministre français, Athènes

(Pour Constantinople seulement.)

Le 22 mars 1922
Ministre français, Athènes

Le 22 mars 1922
Ministre français, Athènes

(Pour les deux postes.)

Le télégramme suivant, qui est signé par Lord Curzon, par M. Schanzer et par moi

"Les Ministres des Affaires étrangères des trois grandes Puissances, réunis à Paris en vue de rétablir la paix dans le Proche Orient et d'être mis à même de faire des propositions pour l'évacuation de l'Asie Mineure, sans nouvelles pertes de vies et de biens, estiment que leur premier devoir est de recommander instamment une suspension immédiate d'hostilités aux Gouvernements intéressés. Les conditions de l'armistice proposé seraient les suivantes

ARTICLE 1^{er}

Le 22 mars 1922

ARTICLE 2

"Tout en conservant les lignes générales occupées actuellement par le gros de leurs forces, les belligérents devront ramener en arrière leurs éléments avancés, de manière à supprimer tout contact et à ouvrir un intervalle libre de troupes. Les commissions locales composées de représentants des commandements grec et turc et d'officiers alliés.

ARTICLE 3

"Pendant la durée de l'armistice, aucun renforcement en personnel ou en matériel ne pourra être opéré sans les armes appropriées, aucun enlèvement d'armes ou de matériel ne pourra être effectué.

ARTICLE 4

Les commissions locales agissant sous une direction alliée commune, seront attachées à l'une et à l'autre des armées belligérantes. Elles auront qualité pour contrôler, dans chacune de ces armées, l'exécution des clauses de l'armistice, et pour régler les incidents qui pourraient se produire.

à cette occasion. Elles auront également qualité pour les autorités ou agents, en vue d'assurer la protection des

" Les commandements en chef hellénique et ottoman s'engagent à accepter à exécuter loyalement l'arbitrage des commissions alliées

ours au moins avant l'expiration de la période d'armistice en cours.

De concert avec vos collègues, vous demanderez qu'une réponse vous soit adressée dans le délai le plus bref possible

E 3302 3302 44,

No 67

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received March 27)

(No. 283.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 21, 1922

I HAVE the honour to report that although there exist no direct returns to

comparative statistics of salt consumption throw considerable light on the subject, particularly as regards the shrinkage of population in the limits of Turkey's present frontiers. The Turkish salt monopoly supply these statistics, save as regards the extensive but thinly populated Mesopotamia, Arabia and Tripoli in Africa, regions detached from the Empire

or consequently remain outside any comparison based on monopoly statistics. Anyway, as will be explained

will spread industries, as consumed by man and beast and, since it is an article of present necessity, the demand for it is proportionately constant. Unfortunately there is no accurate record of quantities for each of these two categories of consumers. One and their cattle, their transport and other animals, has during the last decade of heavy present possible for the purpose of making a comparison.

statistics are to hand (1919-20) is represented approximately by the following figures of reduced salt consumption:

(a.) Within the present frontiers of the Empire, including disputed provinces (Syria and Thrace) —	Reduction of Animal Consumption	
	Per head	
10,000 tons in 1910-20 and 153,000 in 1910-11.	35	
are as it stood in 1910-11		
1910-20 and 235,000 in 1910-11.		

These figures have been given to me by the Ottoman Public Debt

I have &c

HORACE RUMBOLD, High Commissioner.

E 2310/930 44]

No. 66A.

Count de Salis to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received March 27)

No. 41)

My Lord,

Rome, March 18, 1922

A FEW days ago Cardinal Gasparri, in connection with the question of the French protectorate of Catholics in the East, referred to his note of the 6th March, which was forwarded to your Lordship in my despatch No. 40 of the 9th March; the British and French Governments were not in accord with regard to the nature of the agreement on the subject arrived at in April 1920 at San Remo.

I read to his Eminence the text of the note addressed to M. Poincaré on the 2nd February last by Lord Hardinge. The Cardinal replied that the French Embassy had given him a copy of their reply, but at the moment he could not lay it out. His recollection was that he could not understand M. Poincaré's reasoning.

This morning, as I had received copies of the correspondence from your Lordship, I took an opportunity of mentioning the matter. The note maintained that a French renunciation could only affect the temporal, civil, and administrative aspects of the French Government to suppress the religious and ecclesiastical aspects, which would be left by the competent ecclesiastical authorities. The Cardinal, however, was unable to admit that the Vatican would be bound by such a renunciation. In the case of the Holy See, it would have been a serious matter to discuss, and the modifications in this

when I pointed out to Cardinal Gasparri that the Holy See was in with the view constantly maintained by the Holy See that the liturgical honours stood in the relation of principal and accessory, and that if for any reason the principal — the protectorate — disappeared, the accessory — the honours — would *ipso facto* disappear also. There would be need for special discussion with the Vatican about eliminating them. The Cardinal assented, but if the French Government agreed with other Governments that the protectorate should be abolished, they were certainly no longer in a position to claim from the Vatican the fulfilment of any of its conditions. The Cardinal ended at the effort made by M. Poincaré through an appeal to the Canon Law to support a line of argument which the Cardinal evidently considered to be unsound.

I pointed out to the Cardinal that the communication I had made to him under your Lordship's instructions expressly referred to the protectorate in the East, and not in Palestine alone, while I note that, according to Lord Hardinge's despatch No. 372 of the 12th February, it is laid down in the procès-verbal of San Remo that "there will no longer be any question of the protection of the Catholics in the East by one nation or another." The Cardinal repeated what he has already said in his note, that the Holy See would be bound by the terms of the agreement between the British and French Governments as to what had been settled at San Remo.

I have, &c

J. DE SALIS

Minutes of the Second Meeting of Foreign Ministers at the Quai d'Orsay at 10.30 A.M., March 23, 1922 — (Received at Foreign Office, March 27)

Present

M. Bargeton
Marquess Carson of Kedleston.
Mr R G Vansittart
Mr L G. F. Plumbe

Signor Schanz
 Marquis Visconti-Vuosta
 Signor Giariglio

Interpreter M. Camerlynck

† *continued*

M. Poincaré read a telegram from General Pellé which seemed to show that if Lord Curzon's proposal attained an armistice on the existing situation was much more favourable for the Allies. It would be better for the Allies to delay the evacuation of Asia Minor and have time to make the necessary arrangements.

Annunciation of Axi Minor

If Poincaré said that this telegram did not change the situation, General Curzon, telling the press that the Foreign Ministers had instructed their military authorities to examine the necessary preparations for the evacuation of Asia Minor, and that an evacuation formed part of their programme. They wanted to get the Turks to evacuate. If they failed to secure peace, the three countries, as the whole question of Islam in Morocco and India. Morocco the Sultan had a real respect and religion. The mere fact of the signature of the Agreement of Angora had had the best effect, as Lord Curzon was aware, he (M. Poincaré) regretted the form of that agreement but such was the fact. It would be a real disaster for each of the three Powers with such large Moslem interests if they failed to bring the Turks to accept peace.

It was accordingly essential, as General Pelle said, to obtain the acceptance of the armistice by the Turks, and therefore to show that the Allies were preparing for a final attack on the Greeks at once.

[illegible]

wished to make one further observation. The British Empire was just as much interested in the Islamic world as France. We had to pay attention to the views held in India just as M. Poincaré had to do in the case of Morocco. It was necessary to avoid giving the impression that one Power was more interested than another in Islam. M. Poincaré had referred to the Sultan of Morocco and the Angora Agreement. He (Lord Curzon) had heard from many quarters that French officials in Morocco took credit for special friendship for Islam by reason of the Angora Agreement. This was a great mistake. He (Lord Curzon) had no intention of trying to gain credit for special consideration for Turk or Greek, Moslem or Christian.

Signor Schanzer agreed to the proposed communication to the press.

M. Poincaré thanked Lord Curzon and Signor Schanzer. He added that he wished to emphasise that the Allies were solid and united. He only referred to Morocco because he did not think it was for him to refer to India. As to the alleged action of French officials in Morocco, it was surely only a case of independence and excess of zeal on the part of their agents. Lord Curzon knew how difficult it was to control subordinate agents. In any case, it was in the general interest to preserve calm and order in all the Islamic world, which the Bolsheviks were seeking to trouble even, for instance, in Tunisia. It was, therefore, a vital interest of each Empire to do what they could for the Moslem world. He thanked his colleagues for agreeing to the proposed communication to the press, which should exercise a restraining influence on the Turkish extremists.

Lord Curzon proposed the following wording:—

The military authorities, under the presidency of Marshal Foch, have invited to-day to consider the conditions for the peaceful evacuation of Asia Minor in the event of this evacuation being decided upon by the Council of Paris as part of the general settlement, on the lines prepared by the military advisers in Constantinople.

M. Poincaré thought this went too far.

Lord Curzon said that at that table they could only agree to the evacuation as part of a general regulation of outstanding questions.

M. Poincaré agreed that this went without saying, but it might be supposed that evacuation was not necessarily to be part of the general settlement. He

might run: "Les trois Ministres des Affaires Étrangères ont chargé les experts militaires, sous la direction du Maréchal Foch, d'examiner sur la base du plan déjà préparé par les généraux à Constantinople les conditions de l'évacuation pacifique d'Asie Mineure comme faisant partie du règlement général de l'Asie Mineure à

Lord Curzon did not like the words "comme faisant partie," and suggested the presumption that this will be a feature of the general settlement. He was not not to consent to evacuation by itself, we did not want to increase the of the Turks refusing the general terms of peace because evacuation was

Signor Schanzer suggested "contemplated as forming part of the general settlement."

Lord Curzon suggested that the drafting of the communication should be left until the end.

M. Poincaré said that it was not a question of drafting. France would accept no agreement without the evacuation of Asia Minor.

Lord Curzon pointed out that M. Poincaré went further than this: his formula suggested that the Turks would obtain the evacuation of Asia Minor in any case apart from the general settlement, they could reject certain points and still get evacuation. He suggested "subject to the acceptance of the other conditions of the general settlement under consideration," instead of "as forming part of the conditions &c."

It was finally agreed that the formula should run as follows:—

three Ministers for Foreign Affairs have invited the military experts already prepared by the military commanders at Constantinople, the conditions for the peaceful evacuation of Asia Minor, subject to the acceptance of the other conditions of the general settlement in course of preparation."

Minorities

Lord Curzon then said that yesterday they had discussed the question of the question of minorities. The Armenian question ought to be reserved for such special treatment as might be found necessary but it was of course included as well in the general question of minorities. The first question was whether Turkish law really provided for minority representation. In the existing vilayet law there was provision for the representation of local elements, but not for any proportional representation of religious communities or racial minorities. There were thus no safeguards. Again, there were the old provisions in Turkish law for extending ecclesiastical and educational privileges to non Moslem communities. These the Armenians. The Treaty of Sevres restored these privileges, and we ought to insist on this.

Before passing on he would like to remind his colleagues of the extent to which the intervention of the Allies in the present case was necessary. The Turks, when faced with evidence of massacres, took up an attitude of innocence, and maintained that these events were due to acts of hostility or violence on the part of the victims. It was not the case. He recalled the French evacuation of the outskirts of Cilicia the massacres of Armenians.

He would not dogmatise about the position or pay of the commissioners—there would be difficult questions in connection with the expenses of maintenance, for the League could hardly defray the cost, and even if it were imposed on Turkey by the Treaty of Peace, it might prove impossible to recover the charge. The best plan, however, would be to invite the Council of the League to appoint individual representatives

to visit or reside in the various localities where they could associate themselves with prominent local persons, such as the representatives of the Powers, merchants and missionaries and look after the interests of minorities either continuously or from time to time. These gentlemen would be under the High Commissioner at Constantinople, who had already been appointed, but their reports should be direct to the Assembly of the League for its annual consideration, and thus brought before the public opinion of the world. Speaking broadly his propositions might be summed as follows:

1. Reassertion of all privileges and guarantees which already find a place in the European Minorities Treaties, the law of Islam, the secular law of Turkey or the Treaty of Sèvres.
2. The League of Nations to be constituted the special protector of Muslim minorities in Europe and non-Turkish minorities in Turkey.
3. League Commissioners for certain areas.
4. Reports of these League Commissioners to be sent annually to the Assembly of the League.

Signor Schanzer said that he shared Lord Curzon's views. It was important that they should show that they interested themselves in the minorities, it was impossible to find real guarantees, and if there was a recurrence of massacres, they would bear a great responsibility. He was in agreement with the general lines of Lord Curzon's proposals, but felt certain doubts as to particular articles of the Treaty of Sèvres, e.g., article 142 which dealt with conversions to Islam, it was not desirable to increase feeling between the minorities. He felt some doubts as to the number of the Commissioners, but this was more a question of detail. In principle he agreed Lord Curzon's idea of bringing in the League as much as possible. He thought that Commissioners were preferable to Commissions on the ground of cost, which from his experience he regarded as a very important consideration. The mechanism, however, must not be too elaborate, and there must not be too much interference with the Turkish Government. He agreed with the idea of annual reports, which was the most suitable method of interesting the public opinion of the world.

M. Poincaré associated himself with the views of Lord Curzon and Signor Schanzer as to the necessity of protecting the minorities against the recurrence of massacres, but said that the Greeks had also been at fault. It was true that it had been thought necessary to insert more stringent provisions in the Treaty of Sèvres than in the minority clauses of the other treaties. The great difficulty was, however, to impose anything on the Turks, whose views were known. It would therefore be better first to seek a basis in the European treaties, and then to have recourse to the Treaty of Sèvres.

The Powers had before the war a special position entitling them to look after the minorities in Greece. In 1920 they had abandoned that position, and it had been replaced by the Greek Minority Treaty of the 10th August, 1920, article 1 of which made the protection of minorities a fundamental law of Greece. M. Poincaré then read the Greek minority treaty substituting throughout the word "Turkey" "Greece".

If the Allies proposed conditions like those in article 141 of the Treaty of Sèvres, the mistake had been committed. They had negotiated too theoretically with Turkey. They were not in a position to apply the terms of the clauses in question. They had not the force to impose any terms they pleased, as they had had in the case of the other treaties. They could not to-day impose terms which it had been impossible to enforce even in 1921. They must face realities. They could not resurrect the Treaty of Sèvres. They must not give the Angora nationalists the impression that they were to be treated as savages. They must treat them like the inhabitants of a European country.

Lord Curzon said that M. Poincaré had said very hard things about the Treaty of Sèvres. He would remind them that the present President of the French Republic, M. Millerand, shared the responsibility for it. M. Poincaré looked at the matter almost entirely from the point of view of the Turks. He had said with much force that the Allies must offer such terms as the Turks would accept. It was said that the Turks ought to be treated like European nations, that this would flatter them and secure their adhesion to the Allied proposals. To assume such an

attitude, however, was to ignore facts. While the Greeks had been guilty of misdeeds, it was, broadly speaking, true that the Turks had stood for barbarity and savagery for sixty years. It was impossible after past experience to mete out exactly similar treatment to Turks and Europeans. They must, of course, omit from the Treaty of Sèvres clauses that were obsolete or that were needlessly and exasperatingly severe. Articles 142 and 144, for instance, as Signor Schanzer had said, had not been enforced two years ago. He, Lord Curzon, did not desire to commit himself to particulars in regard to proposals for the reassertion of particular guarantees.

M. Poincaré had read the excellent clauses of the Greek Minority Treaty. In that treaty however, the only guarantee for execution was a vague reference to the League of Nations. Turkey was however on a different footing. It was useless merely to substitute the name of Turkey for that of Greece in the Greek Minority Treaty. Much more was required and this could be found in the work of a long series of treaties dating from that of Berlin.

For the present what they had to do was to agree upon broad principles, though they might approach them from a different angle of vision. Later on a committee of experts might sit in London in 1920, and might elaborate more detailed clauses for the execution of the general declaration now to be made.

M. Poincaré thought there was least agreement about the Treaty of Sèvres. It was not a treaty at all. It was merely a draft, which had been signed but not ratified. No French Government could uphold the Treaty of Sèvres. The Turkish treaty was at the time relegated to the second rank and was prepared in London under the auspices of the British Government. The French Government did not know who had made it. Each Power was constrained to accept what would be accepted by its Parliament.

They would not send a ship or a military force. Lord Curzon had said that he, M. Poincaré was thinking of expediency, not justice. This was not so. He only aimed at such justice as was practicable. He merely suggested that they should take the minority clauses of European treaties as a starting point, and elaborate them in detail for Turkey in a practical manner, and one which would permit of execution. They must elaborate the League of Nations guarantee which was

Hungary and Greece however should offer the same guarantees as Turkey. They should arrange for general reciprocity though he wished to make suggestions as to the methods proposed by Lord Curzon, which were too cumbersome.

Lord Curzon said he wished to add one last word about the Treaty of Sèvres. It was not drawn up by irresponsible people sitting under his Lord Curzon's eye in London. France had been represented by her Ambassador and by other members of the French Government. It was discussed and revised line by line almost word by word at San Remo in the presence of M. Barthélemy. It was not sufficient to leave the League of Nations to work out the guarantees. The conference must make some suggestion to it, and this was the object of his proposal.

Signor Schanzer thought that the points of view must be brought closer together. It was true that the Turks were not on the same level as the European Governments. While he wondered whether they could limit themselves to the European minority clauses, Italian public opinion might accept that with difficulties. He thought that the clauses in the Treaty of Sèvres which should be retained. It would be possible to take the Greek treaty and add to it some articles of a temporary character, subject to revision.

Lord Curzon offered to prepare a formula, to give effect to his proposals and to submit it in the afternoon.

(At this point the conference adjourned for luncheon.)

No. 619.

			Present
For France	M. Poincaré, M. Perrotti de La Rocca.
For Great Britain	Marquess Curzon of Kedleston, Mr. R. G. Vansittart, Mr. E. G. Forbes Adam.
For Italy	...		Signor Schanzer, Marquis Visconti-Venosta, Signor Guariglia.

Interpreter, M. Camerlynck

Formula (see Annex I to these minutes) was then read

not covered by
would be of

Signor Scammier suggested that perhaps a general reference might be made to the "different treaties" instead of special reference to the Treaty of Devres.

Mr Pomares said that that was what he desired. He feared the action of the extremists at Angola if weapons were placed in their hands. To avoid this he would propose to accept Signor Dehaener's proposal.

Lord Curzon suggested that, to meet M. Poincaré and to avoid the difficulty arising from the non-ratification of the Treaty of Sévres, reference might be made to the "various treaties which have been drawn up since the Armistice," and (c) could then be suppressed.

... he suggested that they should
the Governments of Greece and

4. 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1030 1031 1032 1033 1034 1035 1036 1037 1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045 1046 1047 1048 1049 1050 1051 1052 1053 1054 1055 1056 1057 1058 1059 1060 1061 1062 1063 106

M. Poincaré asked, with reference to article 6, who would draw the attention of the League to the matter.

Lord Curzon suggested that a formula should be found for this in the treaty on the lines of other minority treaties.

Moreover, some minorities would be omitted, e.g., the Assyrian Chaldeans in the south-eastern vilayets. If, on the other hand, the south-eastern vilayets were mentioned as well as the eastern, too large an area would be specified.

Lord Curzon urged that these articles were the main protection offered to the Greeks. The bulk of the Treaty of Sevres was to disappear. The population of Pontus and Smyrna would regard themselves as deserted.

4. Poincaré seemed to regard too exclusively the Turkish point of view. If one had not the courage to describe the areas where the population were to be protected, what safeguard would there be? There was no more offence in mentioning districts in Asia Minor than in Thrace, which the Turks would wish to have mentioned, at any rate Western Thrace, which, it was already agreed, was not to be returned to Turkey. But Lord Curzon would willingly specify the area where the Assyrian Chaldeans were

M. Poincaré feared the effect of mentioning nearly the whole of Asia Minor, and added that, by reference to Thrace, Turkey would know that she was to come it.

Lord Curzon could not agree with M. Poincaré. Surely it was better to specify areas than to suggest that the commissions should roam all over Asia Minor. There were minorities everywhere. His proposal was less offensive to the Turks. As regards the mention of Thrace, he did not wish to prejudice or anticipate a decision. They were not going to publish or mention these formulas until the terms were ready to be handed to the Greeks and Turks. If they decided to give back the whole or part of Eastern Thrace they could specify the area to be allotted, or they could mention Western Thrace only.

STRAUS. Indeed, Allied liberty of action might be limited thereby.

U. Poincare agreed. Again, what was to be said regarding Salonica?

Lord Curzon could not share his colleagues' view. Attention must be drawn to such important areas. The word "especially" meant simply "notamment" French. He would ask his colleagues, as Christians, to agree to a treaty with a duty to the Christian minorities. He was overwhelmed with petitions from everywhere. When a special régime was mentioned for Smyrna, M. Poincaré had said he thought that the minority clauses were the proper place for safeguards for Smyrna. He now wanted to drop all mention of Smyrna. In this case Lord Curzon would be forced to return to the proposal of a special regime for Smyrna. He did not wish to do this.

¶ Poincaré suggested that experts could specify the places. It was not necessary to mention them in a preliminary communication to the Greeks and Turks.

Lord's argument urged that it really was necessary. It was not proposed that the terms should be given to the press, but should merely be included in the general proposal to be made to the Turks and Greeks. They were going to propose preliminary terms to Turkey and Greece, who would have to accept or refuse. If the former accepted, they could say later that they had not expected such and such an area to be affected.

M. Poincaré suggested that it would be advisable to refer such a resolution as this or elaboration by experts here in Paris.

The experts would then have to elaborate them at Constantinople.

Mr. POINCARRE said that that was not his point. He was suggesting that it would be better to refer these formulae to the experts here in Paris.

Lord Curzon said he saw no reason for referring his general formula to experts. There was no doubt as to the presence of minorities in the areas specified.

M. Poincaré asked why Salonica and the Aegean Islands could not be included.

Signor Schanzer pointed out that other areas were not excluded by the words of article 6, which only spoke of attention being given to them.

Lord Curzon pointed out that there could be no parity between Asia Minor and Greece, where the Moslem minority was relatively very small compared with the Christian minorities in Asia Minor.

It was finally agreed to add "Thessaly" after "Thrace."

The formula was then agreed to subject to these corrections (see Annex 2).

Lord Curzon then referred to the question of Armenia. What the Allies must have in mind were the pledges they had given in differing degrees and forms at various times during and since the war. There was also public opinion in America to be considered, where large sections took a deep interest in the Armenian question and the whole question of the Christian minorities in Turkey. He would recall especially to M. Poincaré an Allied conference at which he thought M. Ribot or M. Briand had been present during the war in 1917 to draw up the statement of the Allies' peace terms, among which had been included an independent or autonomous Armenian State. Further he would remind the conference of the attempt to find a mandatory for Armenia after the war when the Council of the League of Nations had failed to find any country willing to undertake the obligation, just as the Supreme Council had failed to find one.

M. Poincaré provided for an independent Armenian State to include territory from the eastern vilayets of Turkey. President Wilson, as an arbitrator, had sketched out the frontiers of this State in the eastern vilayets in the autumn of 1920. The next phase was the London Conference in March 1921, at which the general proposals put forward to the Turks and Greeks had included a provision that territory should be assigned for a national home for Armenians on the eastern frontier of Turkey, the boundaries of which were to be fixed by a special commission appointed by the League of Nations to examine the territory. The pledges given in the case of Armenia had indeed been very serious. Particular reference should be made to the obligations incurred by France and Italy in respect to the special protection of the minorities in their zones under the Tripartite Agreement. In particular, the French Government had, in raising the Legion d'Orient, given some general assurance of their particular regard for the future independence of Armenia.

M. Poincaré would recall that when France evacuated Cilicia under the Franklin-Bouillon Agreement she endeavoured to satisfy her obligations towards the minorities by taking special guarantees from the Turks. So much so that she was obliged, however, that the refugees poured out of Cilicia with the retreating troops in order to escape the Kemalists' terror and went to Cyprus and the Syrian ports. There was, of

course, no doubt as to the fact that the State of Russian Armenia, this State was, in fact, now the sovietised republic of Erivan, which, by the Treaty of Kars of 1921, had been restricted to a small territory round the town of that name. It was full of refugees from Turkey who had poured in during the war, a recent telegram spoke of a population of some million and a half including 400,000 Turkish refugees. In seeing Yussuf Kemal recently, Lord Curzon had reminded him that, when the question of assigning Turkish territory to an Armenian State had been raised in March 1921 with Bekir Sami, the latter, while admitting that he had no mandate to agree to a solution, was in no way surprised at the proposal, and had promised to recommend it to his Government. Yussuf Kemal seemed less amenable than Bekir Sami, but it was surely a better solution that the Armenians should leave Turkey rather than be massacred, and, if so, it might be preferable to increase the independent Armenian State by some addition of Turkish territory in order to hold a larger population. This was a matter for consideration.

As to the number of Armenians wished to return was Cilicia. Impartial American pre-war figures had given a minority of about 200,000 Christians, mostly Armenians, for this area. But since the war, and particularly since the evacuation of French troops, this number had been reduced to a few thousands. France had special obligations towards this Christian population, not only because of the Tripartite Agreement, but

owing to her position in Syria, and the assurances of a more formal nature given to her with all Allied obligations, that some special régime should be established over Turkish sovereignty could be preserved, and the governor might perhaps be appointed in consultation with the League of Nations. The area could be specified in the Treaty of Peace, or a small area round the sanjak of Marash. To this centre France and Great Britain could send any Armenian refugees still on their territories. The rich Armenian communities scattered through the world might well find money for the development of the territory, and make this small Armenian community prosperous and a source of strength. The eastern corner of Turkey could not be followed up in the present political situation in that area, the Allies should at least endeavour to satisfy their consciences by a equitable solution by trying to create a special "foyer" for the Armenians.

M. Poincaré admitted that Lord Curzon's historical résumé had been very valuable.

The practical question now, however, was where were the Armenians ready to be resettled. It was useless, therefore, to endeavour to do anything for them in this direction. It might be possible, however, to create a national home for them in the eastern vilayets. M. Poincaré had had information showing that there were some 100,000 Armenians still in these vilayets.

Lord Curzon intervened to remark that Yussuf Kemal had not admitted to him the existence of any such minority at the moment in this territory.

M. Poincaré thought that as the Armenians were still in the eastern vilayets, the Armenian refugees in the eastern vilayets should be resettled in the eastern vilayets. The question of a national home in the eastern vilayets to be explored.

Signor Schanzer said that he thought it would be difficult after the war to leave the Armenians in the eastern vilayets. Nevertheless, the Allied Powers could not abandon the idea of doing something for the Armenians. The question must be further studied. Perhaps in some way the interest and help of the League of Nations might be specifically enlisted for this object. The question of the Armenians in the north of Turkey. Which the Russian Government suggested it might be possible to treat with the new Government with regard to assisting the Armenians in the north of Turkey.

Lord Curzon felt that M. Poincaré only offered them counsels of despair. M. Poincaré had said that the Armenians were now to be found. Surely that was not a fair test. If this argument were adopted a wholesale expulsion of a large population from a country would put an end for ever to its claim for the recovery of its home. Some 700,000 Turkish Armenians had fled to Russian Armenia during the war. If M. Porretti's estimate of the Armenians now in the eastern vilayets had come from M. Porretti's estimate, Lord Curzon doubted the accuracy of the estimate. M. Porretti's estimate was a kind of prisoner at Angora, and the Armenians were now to be found in the eastern vilayets the Allies were now to be found in the eastern vilayets. M. Porretti's estimate remained the alternative of doing nothing. M. Poincaré used the argument that, as France had failed to do anything for the Armenians, she should be allowed to do nothing. Lord Curzon had understood however from

M. Briand that the real reason for the departure of the French troops from Cilicia was not the pressure of the Kemalist army, but the expense of maintaining troops in this area. M. Briand had admitted to him that they could not have necessary credits from the Chamber. The whole position was surely very delicate. The Great Powers were now jointly proposing terms of peace to the Government of Turkey. The case of Cilicia was only one. There might actually be only 2,000 or 3,000 Armenians in Cilicia now, but the 80,000 Armenian refugees scattered over Syria, at Alexandretta, Beyrout and elsewhere, should also be included in the calculation. Signor Schanzer had been right in saying that the Allies had an obligation to try and restore these people to their homes in Cilicia. M. Poincaré had spoken of the wealth of Cilicia as a reason for the Turks refusing to restore it. He thought that was equally a reason for allowing the Armenians to return and enabling them to use their very great capacities for increasing the richness of the soil. The Allies might fail, but it would be glorious to fail in trying to do something for the Armenians. Mustapha Kemal might refuse the Allied proposal as regards Cilicia, but, if he did, the Allies would at least have done their best and endeavoured to meet their obligations honourably. Whatever proposal was put forward should be made as palatable as possible to Turkey and some responsibility should be given to the League of Nations. As for M. Poincaré's suggestion that the Armenians did not wish to return to Cilicia, information from the spokesmen of the large Armenian communities in England, who had perhaps come to regard England as their special protector, was quite to the contrary.

M. Poincaré said he wished to state that France had done her best to keep intact the Syrian frontier and thus keep under her mandate part of the Cilician plain for the Armenians. M. Briand had sent strict injunctions to M. Franklin-Bouillon, who had done his very best to persuade the Turks to agree. M. Bouillon had failed. The Turks declared that they were now in a different position to that of 1918, a new State had been formed with new aspirations, and they could not be expected to do more than one of the richest parts of their country. The question was the actual force on the spot. Neither Italy, nor France, nor the United States could send troops to Syria. The three Foreign Ministers could not, by wishing, restore the Armenians to Cilicia. The Turks, if the Allies put forward the proposal would ask the Allies to come and establish the Armenians in Cilicia themselves. M. Poincaré had not noticed that the Italians had made any suggestion as to establishing the Armenians in the Italian zone. Why should France be required to make this sacrifice of her interests on behalf of the Allies? Why should Cilicia and not another zone elsewhere be selected for the Armenians? If England regarded herself in any way as the protector of the Armenians, why should not England find a refuge for them in her own territories?

M. Poincaré wished to point out that if the League of Nations commissioners were appointed, as had been proposed, in either the French or the Italian zones under the Tripartite Agreement, it was natural that they should be respectively French or Italian not only.

Lord Curzon declared any idea of having suggested an Armenian home in Cilicia was a view to prejudice the French interests. Cilicia offered the only satisfactory Armenian aspirations if it was not possible to do anything in the eastern velayats. He had a letter written from Alexandretta in February which spoke of 20,000 Armenian fugitives there now, something should be done to restore them to their homes.

M. Poincaré had asked him how the Allies could succeed if they had no military force on the spot.

Lord Curzon said that if the Allies had no military force in Cilicia, they were in a hopeless position. If the League were to be of any use, it would have to be able to enforce its decisions.

found and Lord Curzon would like to try to find one in collaboration with Signor Schanzer who seemed to share his view.

M. Poincaré said that he too was ready to try to find a formula if he were invited to collaborate, but, as regards Cilicia, France must make every reserve. Why should not the Allies ask the League of Nations to agree to a home in Turkey and leave the question of the spot to the League? All the Allies were represented on this council.

Lord Curzon said he would like time to consider the matter. He did not himself wish to insist on Cilicia if satisfaction could be found elsewhere.

(The meeting then adjourned for tea.)

Evacuation of Asia Minor

At the next meeting, Marshal Foch, General Weygand, General Gouraud, General Sir Harrington, Colonel Heywood and General Maréchal were present. The proposals for the evacuation of Asia Minor (see Annex 2) were read by General Weygand.

Lord Curzon expressed satisfaction with them and was glad that the experts at Paris had found the proposals made by the Allied generals at Constantinople so satisfactory. There was a difficulty in that civil questions and operations had to be decided with Constantinople while military movements, &c., had to be settled through Angora. He mentioned the point in order that attention might be drawn to this rather difficult question. The same question arose as to the substitution of civil government in the evacuated territory.

M. Poincaré said that as we approached towards peace, the duality between Angora and Constantinople ought to cease. There was a large measure of agreement between them.

Signor Schanzer raised the question of the incidence of the cost of evacuation. He asked who would bear this expense.

M. Poincaré said that even if these costs were attributed to the Greeks and the Turks, it would be the Allies who would eventually pay.

Lord Curzon pointed out that the Greeks had, up to a certain date, been carrying out Allied operations, and after that were acting on their own account. So far as these expenses fell on the Allies they would be a charge on Turkey. It would be better to let the evacuation proceed on the basis that if the costs were attributed to Turkey she would not pay, she never did.

Signor Schanzer asked when the evacuation would begin.

M. Poincaré said that the French Government could not agree to accept the evacuation of Asia Minor until it was clear whether the evacuation should take place after the conclusion of a preliminary peace. If so, it might be possible to put the vote for these expenses and the preliminary peace to the Chambers at the same time.

Lord Curzon said that under these expenses would be included in the expenses of the occupation of Turkey. These charges were covered by the vote for the cost of the occupation of Turkey, which were to be recovered from Turkey. Officers from Constantinople would be used.

General Gouraud suggested that perhaps Syria could lend officers.

M. Poincaré pointed out to General Gouraud that the Syrian credits were not yet voted. He agreed with Signor Schanzer that it would be better to say that the expenses of the evacuation were to be laid to the charge of the two local Governments.

Lord Curzon suggested that it would be better for the Foreign Ministers to think the matter over and consult their financial experts.

It would be necessary for them all to make declarations to their Parliaments.

The military proposals for the evacuation of Asia Minor were then approved, and the military experts then withdrew.

Minorities

Lord Curzon wished to refer again to the question of minorities, as to which general agreement had been reached that morning. In addition, there was the question of protection of minorities by a general system under foreign officers which was generally held to be the most effective form of control. Might not a clause be added to the formula accepted that afternoon as to the principle of placing the gendarmerie under foreign officers?

M. Poincaré thought it useless. The Turks were absolutely intransigent on this point. If this point were put forward it would lead to a certain check. Might it not also be rather offensive to the League of Nations? M. Poincaré would not know. He thought it very well, and urged Lord Curzon not to press his point.

Lord Curzon thought his point had been misunderstood. He had only spoken of Allied officers' attack.

There were said to be some 100,000 Turkish troops in Asia Minor. It was said that the Turks welcomed Allied officers organizing their gendarmerie. This system was not novel at all, it was already in existence. In Cilicia, the French had organized the gendarmerie with French officers.

Again, we were proposing, in order to prevent conscription, the employment of a large force of gendarmerie representative of all the races with the aid of Allied officers. He did not think the proposal was at all a new one, and in his opinion it would be popular with the Turks.

Signor Schanzer understood that foreign officers were very popular in the Straits zone. Perhaps since the war, however, this position had changed.

M. Poincaré thought that Lord Curzon and General Harrington were very mistaken as to the popularity of the gendarmerie. There had been discussion in the Straits zone. The British Government had thought that M. Franklin Bouillon had made a secret agreement about the gendarmerie officers, there were only the public letters, but M. Franklin Bouillon had been able to ascertain that the Nationalists hated the system of foreign officers in the gendarmerie as availing of the old regime. They wanted their own control and officers. It was the new Turkish gendarmerie who had kept excellent order during the evacuation of Cilicia. It was possible, however, that they were specially done on that occasion for the evacuation.

Lord Curzon said that he had made his proposal to make things easier, but as it did not seem acceptable to M. Poincaré, he would not press it in this connection. But he would point out that Colonel Sarrailh claimed to be inspector general of the Turkish gendarmerie in Anatolia. He claimed to be over General Monnet, the head of the Allied Gendarmerie Commission. He (Lord Curzon) was only too glad to learn that Colonel Sarrailh had been making the claim without authority.

M. Poincaré did not accept Lord Curzon's inference as to the situation, but the present question was one of a general system of foreign officers.

Lord Curzon asked what was Colonel Sarrailh's position. We had protested against his claim. If there were to be no foreign officers in Asia Minor, what was the value of an agreement between Paris and Ankara?

Signor Schanzer asked the same question.

M. Poincaré thought that this was a question for the three Ministers to settle separately from the general question of peace with Turkey which was now under discussion. He had particularly asked for an explanation from M. Franklin Bouillon, as he feared that he might have exceeded his instructions and prejudiced the position of France and the Allies.

Lord Curzon pointed out that his reference to Colonel Sarrailh was only made in reply to M. Poincaré's remark that no foreign gendarmerie officers would be accepted by the Ankara Government.

M. Poincaré said that Colonel Sarrailh benefited by an agreement with the Constantinople Government anterior to the present situation. He had not exceeded his

authority; it extended only to the zone under the Turkish Government outside the zone of the Straits.

Lord Curzon asked who had appointed Colonel Sarrailh.

M. Poincaré replied that it was the Turkish Government as a consequence of an agreement made before the war. In any case it was not a matter for discussion at a conference about the treaty of peace.

Press Communiqué

Lord Curzon said that it was a considerable time that had been spent in discussing clauses for the protection of minorities, an agreement had been reached as to the terms to be proposed in relation to the Greeks and Turks in Asia and Europe, and that there was agreement as to a formula bringing in the League of Nations. The following formula was proposed:—

"The three Foreign Ministers have spent a large part of the afternoon on the consideration of the question of the minorities both in Asia and in Europe, and have arrived at agreement on an ensemble of conclusions which will be embodied in the settlement to be proposed to the Turks and Greeks, and in the application of which the League of Nations will be invited to collaborate."

M. Poincaré suggested adding something as to the entry of Turkey into the League.

Lord Curzon suggested that it would be better not to mention this point. It was a matter for the Council to decide. The question of the League of Nations was involved. The Allied Powers had made no such recommendation to the Council about other enemy States, e.g. Belgium.

M. Poincaré feared the repercussion on the Turks.

Lord Curzon thought it unnecessary to be so careful about their feelings. We were only concerned in informing the press of our decision.

M. Poincaré feared that there was a real danger from the Turks, who apparently were already angry about the decision this morning, would be still more difficult after this communiqué. He feared that there was a real danger that the Turks might make war again, and that was why their opinion was more important to the Allies than that of the Greeks.

The above formula was finally approved and the following sentence substituted for the phrase following the word "Greeks":—

"The League of Nations, to which it is thought that the Turks will be invited to be admitted, and which will be invited to collaborate in the application of the measures referred to above."

The Inter Allied Military Commission have submitted to the three Ministers for Foreign Affairs, who have approved them, their proposals relative to the evacuation of Asia Minor.

The three Ministers have approved the proposals and have decided to publish them.

(The meeting then adjourned.)

ANNEX I.

It shall be the duty of the Powers:—

- 1 To secure special guarantees for the minorities in the Turkish dominions in Asia, (4) of the Minorities Convention.
- 2 For the purpose of securing the application of the Convention, to propose to the Turkish Government, and to the League of Nations, the measures which shall be necessary for the purpose.

clauses of the European treaties of 1919 and afterwards, (b) in the Turkish law; the original Treaty of ...
These provisions as finally amended and approved shall be embodied in the articles of the future treaty of peace, and shall be applicable *mutatis mutandis* to all minorities concerned.

1. The League of Nations, to which it is proposed that Turkey will, on the conclusion of peace, be admitted on the same terms as Greece, shall be invited to assume special responsibility, both for the assurance of these guarantees and for the ...

The League of Nations will be invited to appoint, with the consent of the Governments concerned, special commissioners for the supervision of the minority ... in this new treaty, alike in Europe and in Asia.

In Asia Minor the attention of the League will be specially drawn to the need for ... in the following areas: (a) Smyrna, (b) Pontus, (c) Eastern vilayets, (d) Cilicia, and (e) ...

7. It shall be the duty of the ... acting under the general supervision of the High Commissioner of the Council of the League at Constantinople, to pay periodic visits to the areas in question, and, in concert with the local authorities, to concert measures for the due protection of minorities, as provided for in the clauses of the treaty.

8. Reports shall be made by these commissioners directly to the Council of the League, and shall be laid before the annual meeting of the Assembly of the League, in order to ensure that the nations who are represented through the assembly shall be in a position to secure the faithful execution of the stipulations to which the League will have given guarantee.

ANNEX 2

It shall be the duty of the Powers:

1. To secure special guarantees for the protection (a) of the ... in the Turkish dominions in Asia, (b) of the Muslim minorities in Europe ... purpose a special study shall be made by an inter-Allied committee appointed by the conference of the provisions which are contained: (a) in the minority clauses of the various treaties which have been drawn up since the armistice; (b) to the Turkish law.

3. These provisions as finally amended and approved by the Powers shall be embodied in the articles of the future treaty of peace and shall be applicable *mutatis mutandis* to all minorities concerned.

The League of Nations, to which it is proposed that Turkey will on the conclusion of peace be admitted on the same terms as Greece, shall be invited to assume special responsibility both for the assurance of these guarantees and for their effective execution.

5. The League of Nations will be invited, after consultation with the Governments of Greece and Turkey, to appoint special commissioners for the supervision of the minority clauses in the new treaty alike in Europe and in Asia.

In Asia Minor the attention of the League will be specially drawn to the need for ... in the following areas: (a) Smyrna, (b) Pontus, (c) eastern and south eastern vilayets, (d) Cilicia, and in Europe, Thessaly and Thrace.

7. It shall be the duty of these commissioners, acting under the general supervision of the High Commissioner of the Council of the League at Constantinople to pay periodic visits to the areas in question, and in concert with the local authorities, to concert measures for the due protection of minorities as provided for in the clauses of the treaty.

League and shall be laid before the annual meeting of the Assembly of the League in order to ensure that the nations who are represented through the Assembly shall be in a position to secure the faithful execution of the stipulations to which the League will have given guarantee.

Annex 3

Measures to be taken by the Allies in the hypothesis of the evacuation of the Asia Minor by the Turkish troops and of its reoccupation by the Turkish troops.

Evacuation of the Asia Minor by the Turkish troops is an operation delicate and of long duration.
For which purpose:

1. Que ...
2. Que les populations et leurs biens soient garantis contre toutes exactions ou représailles de la part de l'une ou de l'autre des deux armées.
3. Que les opérations soient préparées et régies en vue d'un programme général.
4. Qu'un organe interallié soit chargé d'établir ce programme en concert avec les ... et qu'il soit introduit dans ce ... des pouvoirs nécessaires pour régler les incidents qui pourraient se produire à cette occasion.

1. ... évacuation civile du pays et des forces.
2. Le plan d'évacuation des forces helléniques, réglé par zones successives, a fonction des possibilités de transport, en vue d'éviter toute concentration prématurée des troupes helléniques aux abords des ports d'embarquement.
3. Le plan de réoccupation des forces turques limitant les effectifs d'occupation, la chaque zone, et coordonné avec le plan précédent le manière qu'une bande de terrain libre de troupes soit constamment interposée entre les deux armées pour éviter les contacts.
4. Le plan d'embarquement des forces helléniques.

Pour diriger l'exécution de ce programme général et en assurer la continuité:

- Après de chacune des deux armées ... Une mission alliée comportant des officiers de contrôle, des hommes de troupe et des moyens de transport et de ...
- Une mission alliée destinée, pendant la période d'occupation, à participer à la réorganisation et à contrôler l'emploi des forces de sécurité locale, gendarmerie et police.
- Dans les ports d'embarquement ... Forces interalliées destinées à exécuter au maintien de l'ordre et à la police d' ...
- Smyrne 3 bataillons environ (1 de chaque Puissance).
- Region Brumma Mondiana, Pandemonia

Des forces navales alliées sous commandement interallié (trois cuirassés ou croiseurs, par exemple), avec quelques bâtiments de patrouille, devront contribuer à la police des opérations en chaque point d'embarquement.

L'ensemble des moyens visés ci-dessus sera à prélever sur les forces militaires ...

Il ne peut être fourni par cinq Puissances pour atteindre le total envisagé.

La Commission des Généraux alliés de Constantinople semble qualifiée pour constituer l'organe interallié directeur les opérations. Elle aurait en son sein voulu, ...

* Cette durée peut être établie au maximum de quatre à cinq mois.

... incomberait dans ce cas l'étude immédiate et la préparation complète du programme général et des-*un* vice.

De même, la Commission des Amiraux alliés de Constantinople aurait à régler les

Si les dispositions qui précèdent étaient adoptées, il y aurait lieu de les notifier par compléation aux Gouvernements de Grèce et ottoman

interallie en matière de direction générale des opérations d'évacuation et à prendre toutes mesures pour que les décisions dudit organe soient strictement exécutées par leurs troupes ou agents de l'Administration civile.

Il y aurait intérêt, à cette occasion, à préciser auxdits Gouvernements

1. Que les Alliés ne sauraient en aucun cas accepter la responsabilité du maintien de l'ordre lors de l'évacuation, non plus que le contrôle direct de l'Administration civile.

2. Que les Alliés ne sauraient en aucun cas accepter la responsabilité de l'évacuation; aux autorités ottomanes dès le départ des troupes helléniques.

ANNEX 4

1. L'Armée d'Asie Mineure par les troupes helléniques peut avoir pour conséquence un exode de la population.

Pour parer aux conséquences de l'exode, les Alliés ont décidé de prendre

Ravitaillement

à l'Armée d'Asie Mineure

à l'Armée d'Asie Mineure

de Constantinople.

E 3428 5 44

No. 70

Minutes of the Fourth Meeting of Foreign Ministers at the Quai d'Orsay at 10:30 A.M., March 24, 1922—(Received at Foreign Office, March 31)

Present

For France ...	M. Poincaré M. de Peretti de la Rocca M. Bugeat
For Great Brit. ...	Marquess Curzon of Kedleston M. R. ... M. J. C. ...
For Italy ...	Signor Schuster Marquess Visconti Venosta Signor Guariglia

Interpreter M. Camerlynck

Sir Adam Black and M. des Clapiers were present for the financial question

National Home for Armenians

Lord Curzon reminded that ...

* Cette expression impliquait de plus être basée sur un minimum d'indépendance

Nations. What the Allies found at present difficult to achieve owing to their inability to exert physical force might then be secured through the influence which the League would be able to bring to bear. He could ...

... responsibility of washing his ... of course, meet their full aspirations. It would be a ... but they had placed their aspirations too high, and had failed to remain the ... His formula was an attempt to discharge the responsibility ... Allies in the only way that was possible, and to hand over the ... to the only body that was likely now to be able ...

... Lord Curzon's proposal

... considered that the general idea which had been in their minds ... exactly reproduced by Lord Curzon. He thought ... instances, the only way was to leave it to the League to try and ... This would meet in the only practical manner to-day the ... perhaps, however the place of the national home should not ... but should be left to the League to decide. It was a difficult question, ... a political question

... formula particularly did not mention the locality description. He would, however, be prepared to insert the words "or elsewhere" after the word "Mediterranean," but he would regret to leave the question entirely open.

M. Poincaré replied that the Tripartite Agreement gave France Cilicia as her zone ... "autonomous region" aimed at Cilicia, and the installation of the Armenians in the ... difficulties for that Power

Lord Curzon said that he regarded the matter from a rather different point of view. He asked himself whether the Armenians could somehow recover ... allotted to them in the eastern vilayets by the Treaty of Sévres. ... Cilicia. He ... position was that the British had occupied this area at the end of the war. Later the French had asked us to evacuate, and in a spirit of loyalty and in spite of the burden and expense which the occupation had cost us, we handed the region over to the French.

... the Tripartite Agreement, and we agreed to the French zone with ... abandon Cilicia altogether and made a separate ... the French secured concessions which was now ... but upon the voluntary action of Turkey, and it was by no means clear that France would recover her position as ... Lord Curzon hoped that ... the Armenians. ... Armenians, and France would ... Lord Curzon wished particularly, however, not to be drawn into a difficult political discussion, and not to ... a precise statement in his formula. Nevertheless, it was necessary to say ... in the formula to indicate in general terms where the Armenians were to ... de a home. They must state the fact of ... suitable for such a home were limited in number.

M. Poincaré thought that it was necessary to "mélanger" both the Turkish and French interests. It had to be ... of which Power did most or distributed its forces best. In any case, events had ... the situation ... as regards the obligations and rights of France in her zone.

... the French ...

M. Poincaré enquired whether some such words as "wherever such a home could be found" could be added after the third paragraph of the formula, and whether the fourth paragraph could then be suppressed.

Lord Curzon enquired whether the indication which Lord Curzon desired as to the home had not been given by third paragraph, which really only contemplated two possible places.

Lord Curzon had no objection, in principle, to his proposal being modified. His proposal yesterday, however, that the home should be arranged in the treaty for a home in the eastern states, had had to be abandoned, and it was then that he had drawn up the present suggestion as to the League of Nations. He regretted that he had continually to meet proposals for reducing and weakening his terms, and he would therefore deprecate the omission of the fourth paragraph. M. Poincaré said that M. Poincaré had said he would not press his point, but the fourth paragraph the words from "on the borders".

M. Poincaré expressed his thanks to Lord Curzon. He was occupied by the fear that Turkey would accept the conditions proposed. He did not know what would happen if the proposals were not accepted. They might be able to bring about a very difficult for the Turks, but this was doubtful.

The conference accepted the formula as amended (Amber).

Execution of Armistice

Signor Schanzer read a telegram from the Italian Ministry of War, dated 27th, that if the Greeks were not permitted to remove guns from the armistice they might have serious difficulties. The phrase "in the armistice" was too strong, and the point might be referred to Marshal Foch to explain exactly what the phrase meant.

This was agreed to.

Assyro-Chaldeans

M. Poincaré raised the question of the Assyro-Chaldeans. France was interested for religious reasons, and Agn Petros had asked France to do something for them. M. Poincaré had told him that England and Italy were equally interested, and would be glad if Lord Curzon and Signor Schanzer would see Agn Petros.

Lord Curzon pointed out that the Assyro-Chaldean question was a very complicated one. There were three or four communities of Assyro-Chaldeans, one in the north, one in the south, one in the east, and one in the west. It was useless to see the head of one of these communities, and whether M. Poincaré would be content with the assurance that Great Britain was equally interested with France in the Assyro-Chaldean question.

M. Poincaré said that he would like to do something for the Assyro-Chaldeans. He wanted to be able to say that he had recommended him, and this question of the Assyro-Chaldeans, and, if possible, he would like them to see him.

Lord Curzon and Signor Schanzer said that they would try to arrange this.

Lord Curzon pointed out that the conference would presently, after dealing with Thrace and the Straits, come to the question of finance. The financial experts were in Paris, and he enquired whether it would not be well for them, in the meantime, to consider the particular question of article 232 raised by Signor Schanzer, but the principle of the financial clauses and the future financial administration in

M. Poincaré replied that the French experts had their instructions and could

Signor Schanzer pointed out that a practical question was raised here. The matter which he had brought forward could be taken at once, but the

consideration of the financial clauses generally should be deferred until this question had been dealt with.

M. Poincaré pointed out that the question of the Financial Commission and the Debt Council, &c., was a matter for the experts. They could get together and make general proposals, and the conference could then decide the political question.

Signor Schanzer replied that he would like his question of article 232 taken as soon as possible, but that he would agree to the financial experts beginning their work.

The experts should give their opinion on this point and on the future of the Debt Council and its relation to the Financial Commission.

Lord Curzon stated that at this stage a discussion was only required of the general principles, and that the experts should meet at once and prepare a formula by Monday next. The experts should avoid entering into the details of the revised Treaty of Sevres.

It was agreed that the financial experts should meet at once and prepare a formula on the above lines.

The Press

M. Poincaré referred to the indiscretions of the "Echo de Paris," in which "Pertinax" entered into details of yesterday's discussions about the Armenians and mentioned Lord Curzon's and Signor Schanzer's views as to Cilicia and Erivan. He was enquiring into the matter.

Signor Schanzer said that it was not an Italian indiscretion, and produced official French agency telegrams going into the details of the discussions and the figures and other particulars with regard to the minorities which had been produced by Lord Curzon and M. Poincaré.

Lord Curzon stated that he had no relations with the French press and did not know "Pertinax."

Signor Schanzer said that M. Géraud ("Pertinax") was understood to have received information from the British delegation.

Lord Curzon asked whether "Pertinax" could not be summoned to the conference to explain himself.

Signor Schanzer said that "Pertinax" had been a continual offender as, for example, at Washington. He hoped that M. Poincaré would do all he could to trace the source of the indiscretion.

M. Bassot, of the Haras Agency, then entered.

M. Poincaré asked M. Bassot for an explanation of the indiscretion as to the conference discussions about the Armenians.

M. Bassot said that he exchanged information with his comrades. There was a pool of information.

M. Poincaré asked him to explain exactly who were his sources of information and their nationality.

M. Bassot replied that he could not give precise information on this point. The indiscretion was not a French one, but he could say more.

M. Poincaré said that if M. Bassot did not state where his information was obtained judicial measures might have to be taken.

M. Bassot replied that he could not give precise information as to which Allied delegation gave the information.

Lord Curzon pointed out that "Pertinax" had insisted that he had obtained information from the British Government, and he (Lord Curzon) must press for

M. Poincaré again asked M. Besset for an explanation.

W. Barrett replied that he could not give his sources of information; it was a matter of professional secrecy.

(M. Baguet then withdrew.)

M. Pigneuré said that he would do his best semi-officially to find out what was

Lord Curzon asked whether the judicial enquiry suggested by M. Poincaré could be maintained. (There was a recent case where an English doctor was concerned in which a similar position had arisen.) Otherwise, Lord Curzon would have to reserve liberty to publish a full account and to challenge the reproduction of the accusations in the press. M. Besset had practically brought direct charges against the British and Indian delegations and thus created an impossible position. If such indiscretions were to be passed unnoticed, how were the Allied discussions to continue?

M. Poincaré agreed generally with Lord Curzon, as he had shown in his cross-examination of M. Basset. He must add, however, that "Fortunax" himself had not been accused of having obtained information from the British or Italian delegations. For the rest, it was not possible for a French judge to obtain professional secrets from journalists. All he could do was to ascertain whether any French administrators was at fault. He must remind his colleagues, however, that there were British and Italian journalists here.

Lord Curzon said that he would strongly support all the enquiries which M. Poincaré could make.

The meeting then adjourned.

4598

L'Esprit de

1. The powers of the pledges to which they have given public expression on so many occasions to secure some form of autonomous national existence for the Armenian people, and desirous to reconsider the facts of the present situation, make the following

has been decided to invite the League of Nations to assume a special protection of minorities, alike in Europe and in Asia, and it has been presumed that Turkey will upon the conclusion of peace, be admitted to membership of that body. So the opportunity for the satisfaction of the claims of the Armenians, who, both in numbers and importance, are in the first rank among these minorities.

The Armenian class is summed up in the general aspiration that there shall be provided for them in one or other of the areas in Asia Minor, where they have hitherto been found in considerable numbers, a national home.

Whether such a home can preferably be secured on the borders of the state vilayats of Turkey in Asia or in the more southerly regions bordering on the Mediterranean Sea is a question which is not possible definitely to pronounce.

It shall, however, be an object especially commended by the Powers to the League of Nations that they shall at an early date after the conclusion of peace enter into negotiations with the Turkish Government with a view to the creation of a national home for the Armenians, and shall endeavour to arrange the conditions under which it may be called into being, and be furnished with adequate guarantees for its future existence.

To this object the three Powers promise every assistance in their power, conscious that the interests of the Armenians, of Turkey and of the peace of the East,

ANSWER 2

△ 丁巳仲夏

The three Powers, mindful of the pledges to which they have given public expression on so many occasions, to secure some form of autonomous national existence for the Armenian people, and desirous to reconcile the fulfilment of these pledges with the facts of the present situation, make the following proposal:—

It has been decided to invite the League of Nations to assume a special responsibility for the minorities in the Near East, and it has been pronounced that Turkey will, upon the conclusion of peace, be admitted to membership of that body. Such an occasion will, in the opinion of the Powers, furnish the most favourable opportunity for the minorities to be placed in the first rank among these minorities.

The Armenian claims are summed up in the general aspiration that there should be provided for them in one or other of the areas in Asia Minor where they have hitherto been in considerable numbers, a national home.

Where such a line can but be secured depends on conditions, political, economic and social, upon which it is at present impossible definitely to pronounce.

It shall be an object, especially commended by the Powers to the League of Nations, that they shall, at an early date after the conclusion of peace, enter into communication with the Turkish Government with a view to the creation of such a national home for the Armenians, and shall endeavour to arrange the conditions under which it may be called into being, and be furnished with adequate guarantees for its future existence.

To this object the three Powers promise every assistance in their power, conscious that the solution by consent of the Armenian problem is equally desirable in the interests of the Armenians, of Turkey and of the peace of the East.

E 3340 5 44]

No. 71

*Pronouncement by the Three Allied Foreign Ministers in Paris, March 27, 1922.—
(Revised in Foreign Office, March 30.)*

(Annex 2 to Minutes of Ninth Meeting.)

THE Foreign Ministers of the Allied Powers, France, Great Britain and the United States, having during five days, in the city of London, discussed the situation in the Near East, having consulted at each stage the military and financial experts who were present, have decided to make the following declaration:

The Allied Powers are determined to maintain the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and to ensure the security of the Near East. They have decided to offer to the Ottoman Government the assistance of their military and financial resources, and to offer to the Ottoman Government the assistance of their military and financial resources, and to offer to the Ottoman Government the assistance of their military and financial resources.

The principles which they have throughout borne in mind, and which are the basis of their proposals, have been :—

1. They desire to re-establish peace between the conflicting armies of Turkey and Greece, but to deal fairly with both parties, and to impose upon neither conditions of disarmament or defeat
2. They desire to re-establish the Turkish nation and the Turkish dominion in the areas which may fairly be regarded as their own, with the historic and renowned capital of Constantinople as the centre, and with such powers as may enable them to renew a vigorous and independent national existence
3. They desire to secure full and fair treatment to the followers of the creed of Islam, in the areas which may be regarded as Turkish
4. They desire to compensate the Greek nation for the great sacrifices which they have accepted during the war in the cause of the Allies, and to leave them free scope for their national and economic progress in the future
5. They desire to enable both peoples, in regions where they are contiguous or

where their populations are intermingled, to live in future in conditions of mutual confidence and self-respect.

6. They desire to provide for the protection and security of the various minorities, whether Moslem or Christian, or of other races and creeds who, whether in Europe or Asia, find themselves placed in the midst of larger political or ethnic aggregations.
7. They desire to prevent the recurrence of armed conflict between the Turkish and the European Powers with whom it was recently at war above all in the solution which they propose not to be suspected of activity to one side or the other, but with firm hands to hold the scales even between the two.

With these ends in view the first object of the Allied Powers has been to bring about a suspension of hostilities between the confronting armies in Asia Minor, in order to enable the councils of peace and the prospects of

They have therefore proposed the conclusion of Turkey and Greece, subject to conditions which are scrupulously fair and which were defined by the military authorities under the previous Marshal Fok.

The Government has already signified its acceptance of this proposal. The decision of Turkey is awaited.

The proposal of an armistice has been made with the avowed intention of securing the peaceful evacuation of Asia Minor by the Greek forces and the restitution of Turkish sovereignty over the whole of that region. The arrangements for this

simultaneously been elaborated by the military authorities under Marshal Fok, as are capable of being put into execution without delay. It is calculated that the period required for a complete and peaceful withdrawal of the Greek forces will be somewhat over four months.

It will be observed that, in the event of these proposals being accepted by both parties, the recovery of Anatolia by the Turks, which is believed to be their principal aspiration, will have been attained without any further sacrifice of treasure or territory. Correspondingly the retirement of the Greek troops will be effected with honour.

Should this operation be successfully accomplished, the Turkish sovereignty in Asia will exist unimpaired from the Mediterranean to the Straits and the Black Sea, and from the borders of Transcaucasia, Persia and Mesopotamia to the shores of the

Accepting the imperative necessity, which is the result both of historical and geographical causes, for the protection of the minorities of alien race or religion who are

European possessions of Greece, the Powers have proposed full and adequate security, without distinction of race.

These provisions will be based both upon the stipulations contained in existing treaties or drafts of treaties and in the secular or religious law of the countries concerned. Furthermore, the Powers have decided to invite the League of Nations to collaborate in this object by the appointment of special commissioners to superintend the execution of these provisions in the areas and for the communities who are principally concerned.

The case of the Armenians has called for special consideration by reason of both of the undertakings entered into by the Allied Powers in the course of the war and of the cruel sufferings of that people. Accordingly, the aid of the League of Nations is sought, over and above the protection accorded by the minority provisions to which reference has already been made, in order to obtain for the Armenians the satisfaction of their traditional aspirations for a national home.

It is the policy of the Allied Powers to leave the past behind them and to place the future of the East in the hands of the future. The Allied force must be placed in the hands of the future.

entrance of the Straits. This also will be a demilitarised zone. The Allied garrison will consist of a force sufficient to secure the entrance to the Dardanelles.

The demilitarisation of the Straits will be identical with the existing arrangement of the Straits. No further demilitarisation is proposed on the southern shores of the Marmora, with the exception of the peninsula of Ariaki. On the Asiatic shores of the Bosphorus the demilitarised zone will be identical with the existing neutral zone. The islands of Lemnos, Imbros, Tenedos, Samothrace and Myiense, outside the Dardanelles, and all the islands in the Marmora will equally be

the Asiatic shore of the Straits will be identical with the existing arrangement of the Straits. No further demilitarisation is proposed on the southern shores of the Marmora, with the exception of the peninsula of Ariaki. On the Asiatic shores of the Bosphorus the demilitarised zone will be identical with the existing neutral zone. The islands of Lemnos, Imbros, Tenedos, Samothrace and Myiense, outside the Dardanelles, and all the islands in the Marmora will equally be

According to the European shore of the Dardanelles and the Marmora the three Ministers have been confronted with the difficult and anxious problem of the future of Eastern Thrace. On this

that some, at any rate, of the the Euro

military menace of invasion or to the invidious proximity of a neighbour with whom it had recently been at war.

Such dangers it was obvious would be most effectively removed (a) by the removal to a sufficient distance from Constantinople of the projected frontier; (b) by the effective neutralisation of the areas outside this line. Furthermore, the Ministers were confronted by the incontestable facts of the existing situation. Whether the attribution of Eastern Thrace to the Greeks by the unratified Treaty of Sevres be or not be held to constitute a valid title, the Greek forces are in effective occupation and the Greek Government is engaged in administering that area, which, moreover, contains and has long contained a considerable and in certain parts a preponderant Greek population. In these circumstances the Ministers were unable to assume the possibility of requiring from Greece not merely the complete evacuation of Asia Minor to which it must be remembered in passing that Greece was invited

moderation of resources

Foreign Ministers of the Powers in their expert advice. These will run from the neighbourhood

in a northerly and north-easterly direction to a point on the frontier in the western part of the Straits mountains. This frontier will leave Rodosto, a Greek town, to the Turks. It will place Haba Eski and Kirk Kilisse on the Greek side of the Turkish-Greek frontier. The safety of the frontier is assured by the topographical features of the country, and will be further confirmed by the demilitarisation of almost the entire area of Eastern Thrace both on the Greek and Turkish sides of the frontier. Thus the Greeks will not be able to threaten

pla, and the Turks will not be in a position to attack the Greeks. The periodical inspection of these and the other demilitarised areas will be undertaken by Allied officers attached to the Allied force on the Gallipoli peninsula, the area of whose occupation will be extended eastwards to Rodosto.

It has been considered whether at

one (and indeed several) to cover from the surrounding area. Smyrna, which will revert to Turkey, and Adrianople which will be retained by the Greeks, are in a somewhat analogous position. The Powers will be quite willing to enter into friendly communication with the Turkish and Greek Governments, with a view to the conclusion of a friendly agreement upon

will guarantee a full and fair share to the non-Turkish and the non-further safeguard the religious buildings and institutions of Adrianople.

The three Ministers are not so vain as to suppose that this solution of the Thracian problem will be warmly accepted by either party. The problem admits of no such easy solution. They can only commend it to the public opinion of the world as the proposition which seems to them to be most consistent alike with justice and with the interests of the case.

Passing to Constantinople the three Governments desire to confirm their previously expressed willingness to withdraw altogether the threat that was made at the time of the Treaty of Sèvres to revoke at some future date the retrocession of the capital to the Turks. They confirm the restoration of that city to the full authority of the Turkish Government, and they are further willing to engage that the Allied forces, which are now in the city, shall be altogether withdrawn after the Turkish Government will be invited to garrison the city with a larger force than was contemplated in the Treaty of Sèvres.

There remain the questions of the future armed force of the Turkish State, the financial independence which it will enjoy, and the suggested modification or surrender of the capitulatory rights which are enjoyed by foreigners.

Concerning the armed forces of Turkey, the Allied Powers are unable to depart from the principles which it has been found necessary to enforce in the treaties that have been concluded with all the other States recently at war, or to admit the continuance of the system of conscription. They will, however, be prepared to conclude with the Turkish Government in an amicable spirit the determination of the period within which the voluntary system of recruiting must be established in that country.

As to the numerical strength of the Turkish forces, it is proposed to allow a very moderate increase suggested in London in 1921. The forces now finally proposed are: an army of 40,000, regular army 40,000, or a grand total of 80,000 men, a total which is 10,000 in excess of the forces provided for in the Treaty of Sèvres.

Should the Turkish Government desire the assistance of foreign officers for the organisation of the above-named force of gendarmes—a measure which will probably be found to conduce greatly to its efficiency—the Powers will be ready to place them at the disposal of the Turkish Government.

With regard to finance. The financial clauses of the Treaty of Sèvres shall be revised so as to abandon the proposed Financial Commission, while reconciling the principle of Turkish sovereignty with the protection of Allied economic interests. The pre-war debts to the Allies and a war indemnity fixed at a sum which Turkey can be expected to pay.

An Allied Liquidation Commission shall be set up for the above purposes. In respect of the existing capitulatory system, the three Ministers are anxious to secure to Turkey the largest measure of economic independence consistent with the due protection of the interests of the nationals of their respective countries. For this purpose they are prepared to set up at Constantinople, within three months from the date of the signature of the Treaty, a Commission of technical experts representing the other capitulatory Powers, proposals for the revision of the capitulatory regime in fiscal matters.

The Commission shall be empowered to recommend such measures as may be necessary to safeguard the former against excessive taxation and abuses of the Powers concerned.

As regards the Capitulations in judicial matters, the Allied Powers repeat their former offer to set up within the same period a similar commission to prepare a scheme for the introduction of the proposed scheme. This commission, on which Turkey will be represented, will be at liberty to recommend either a mixed or a unified judicial system.

Such in broad outline are the main features of the settlement which the Ministers of the three Great Powers, acting on behalf of their Governments, have decided unanimously to recommend. These proposals are now submitted primarily to the judgment of the two parties who are directly involved, but secondarily and in a not inferior degree, to that of the civilized world. Nor is it necessary to add that the people or the Government by whom they were deliberately rejected, if such a fortune were to occur, would assume a very grave responsibility before the public opinion of mankind, namely, the responsibility of resuming a struggle which has already begun.

It is only by bringing further ruin and destruction in its train, besides leading to a permanent enmity between the races and creeds of the Near East.

Such in broad outline are the main features of the settlement which the Ministers of the three Great Powers, acting on behalf of their Governments, have decided unanimously to recommend. These proposals are now submitted primarily to the judgment of the two parties who are directly involved, but secondarily and in a not inferior degree, to that of the civilized world. Nor is it necessary to add that the people or the Government by whom they were deliberately rejected, if such a fortune were to occur, would assume a very grave responsibility before the public opinion of mankind, namely, the responsibility of resuming a struggle which has already begun.

Near East Conference, Speech by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the House of Lords, March 30, 1922

(Full Official Report as revised and approved by Lord Curzon)

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston: My Lords, in answering the question asked by Lord Curzon, I am afraid I may have to place a certain strain upon the patience of the House, and, of the very great interest which the proceedings in which I recently took part in Paris have excited in all parts of Europe, and, in the second place, because of the very wide extent of ground which it will be my duty to attempt to cover.

The stages by which we have arrived at the present situation in the Near Eastern problem—the recent stages—have been as follows: it was in August 1920 that the Powers signed in Paris the Treaty of Sèvres. That treaty, though signed by all the Powers, including Turkey herself, remained unratified in the main because of the emergence in Asia Minor of the strong Nationalist movement which is associated with the name of Mustafa Kemal. With a view of terminating the

and held a conference in London in March of last year to which both Greeks and Turks were invited, and to them the Powers there represented made offers with a view to the conclusion of peace. Those offers were, unhappily, not accepted by the two parties concerned, or where they were accepted by one they were rejected by the other.

The next stage occurred in June of last year, when I went to Paris to hold a meeting with representatives of France and Italy, and when we agreed formally to offer mediation to the two belligerent countries. Again, I am sorry to say, our efforts proved futile, the Greek Government at that time being unwilling to place its case before the Powers. The Turkish Government, on the other hand, I need not here or now pursue its varying fortunes. Suffice it to say that the Greeks, although successful in their preliminary advance, failed to reach their supposed objective, which was Angora itself. On the other hand the Turks, though they succeeded in repelling this movement, were unable to push back the Greeks behind the strong military position which they had taken up defended by the line of railway in the heart of Asia Minor.

There the situation has remained ever since. I have long felt, and, indeed, every one of us has felt, that a peaceful settlement of this prolonged conflict was necessary. It was necessary in the first place, in the interests of Turkey, who, whatever the fortunes of the present state of the war has been exhausted by seven and a half years of fighting and stands urgently in need of a settlement of her future. It was equally necessary in the interests of Greece, who, though she was invited into Asia Minor by the Powers assembled in Paris in 1919, has undoubtedly in the prosecution of that campaign, exceeded the limits both of her financial and her physical ability.

It is equally necessary in the interests of the Powers themselves, who have found their authority impaired and their solidarity shaken, or at any rate menaced by the continuance of this warfare, and, as many here will at once remind me, it is perhaps more especially necessary in the interests of the Mohammedan populations not only of Europe, but of Asia as well. We know the strong feelings that have been excited among our own Moslem fellow subjects in India, excited by suspicious very often exaggerated and illegitimate and by propaganda which has not erred upon the side of moderation. It is the whole of the civilized world, which is sick of this continuance of war and longs, in Asia as elsewhere, to settle down to normal conditions of tranquillity and of peace.

For a long time I, at any rate, have held the conviction that only by the closest unity between the great Allied Powers themselves could this solution be attained. It could not, in my view, be reached by separate agreements made between Turkey and the Powers individually, still less by allowing the Turks, in pursuit of their familiar tactics, to play off one party against the other, with a view ultimately to their own aggrandizement. As long ago as 1915, when I assumed the responsibility

will be large numbers who desire to remain, either because they are rooted to the soil, or because they are reluctant for other reasons to leave, or because they recognise, with justice, that their commercial or their agricultural interests are bound up in the future destiny of the country.

Undoubtedly special guarantees will be required, after evacuation has taken place, for the safety of this population, and for their due representation in the referred means will have to be taken to ensure that they have an adequate voice in the local administration. Here again we propose to invite the co-operation of the League of Nations, which will consider the question in the general treatment of Smyrna in Asia and Adrianople in Europe to which I shall refer a little later. In the one case the interests of the Greek and, in the other of the Turkish population have to be provided for, and we shall endeavour to secure that the guarantees that are given to the one community in the one place shall be equally accorded to the other in the other place.

I now pass to the question of the Straits. This is a question which had to be decided, in the main, by military and naval considerations, and in pronouncing upon it we acted upon the unanimous advice of our authorities. The broad considerations which animated us were these—

I now pass to the European shores of the Straits. Here we have an area in which the Greek population is in a preponderance. Gallipoli is, in the main, a Greek city, but it is a place where the Allied occupying garrison can best be placed, where lie the bones of thousands of our fellow subjects who perished in one of the most sacred charge. Accordingly we propose that the European shores of the Straits

As regards the navigation of the Straits, the control of the traffic, the organisation of harbour works and other services, the International Straits Commission, as it was proposed under the Treaty of Sévres, will remain. This will be a body on which all the Great Powers will be represented as well as America if she cares to

Treaty has been ratified and they have been admitted to the League of Nations, Turkey, Bulgaria and Russia, if she satisfies those conditions, will one day be admitted. It is proposed, as it was in London a year ago, that the Chairmanship of that body should be placed in the hands of a representative of the Turkish Government.

ment. I have observed in some organs of the press that because we did not say much about this matter in our Declaration it has been supposed that the International Commission has been dropped or has disappeared. This is not in the least the case. It remains with the full powers and functions as set up in the Treaty of St. Yves.

Let me here add a few words about the demilitarised areas, because they constitute the main guarantee against military danger in the future. The demilitarised area will not be confined to the two sides of the Dardanelles. It will extend to the islands lying outside the mouth of the Dardanelles and commanding its entrance, to the stretch of land which projects into the Sea of Marmora from the Asiatic shore. When we approach the Bosphorus the demilitarised zone will be extended on the Asiatic side to the area of the peninsula of Ismid, which is now controlled by the Allied forces, and is known as the neutralised zone. On the European side of the Bosphorus and the Marmora the whole of the eastern shore, from Constantinople on the east and the mouth of the Maritza on the west to the Bulgarian frontier on the north, with a small exception, will be demilitarised and placed under the inspection of Allied officers.

Thus, whether you look at the situation from the Asiatic side or from the European side, our military authorities have provided for us and guaranteed an area of neutralisation where no force can be allowed, which, in their opinion, constitutes a sufficient security both for the Straits and the Bosphorus and against the resumption of hostilities by either of the two Powers who are now engaged in war in that part of the world.

I think two or more years ago that Constantinople should be given back after the war to the Turks, both as the seat of the Caliphate and as the natural and historic capital of the Turkish Empire. The Powers at no time have had the desire for military, quite apart from political reasons, but for both to remain in prolonged still less in perpetual, occupation of that city. A year ago, in London, we offered as part of our terms to evacuate Constantinople when the Treaty of Peace had been ratified. That promise will be fulfilled at as early a date as is practicable after the ratification of the new peace which we now have in view. The Sultan, who will be allowed to maintain a force, limited in numbers for the purpose in the city of his Government.

that it would not only be unjust to
not merely Anatolia under the en
Turkey, it should, as the seat of the
free from the milit

The problem was, in the main, a military and strategic problem, and accord-

desideratum being to provide adequate security for the protection of the capital and for the territory left to the Turks in Europe. They unanimously recommended to us a line drawn from a place on the neighbourhood of a place called Ganos on the Marmora to the Bulgarian frontier in the north, on the western side of the mountain massif of Stranja. This is a line, as they assured us, of definite geographical and strategical value. It will leave to Turkey a strip of coast of which is predominantly Greek and the trade of which also is largely Greek, and for which, in our arrangement, we shall have to secure special commercial facilities of access to the interior.

On the other hand, it will leave to Greece the whole of the western part of Thrace including the towns of Baba Eske and Kirk Kilisse, with the railway that

already indicated, for the protection of the population, and for the protection of the religious buildings and institutions of Adrianople, somewhat parallel to the conditions that will be required for the Greek populations in Smyrna.

Observe again, that with the exception of a small band around Adrianople in which the Greeks will be allowed to maintain certain forces as a guard against the Bulgarian frontier, the whole of these two areas of Eastern Thrace, Turkish and Greek, will be demilitarised so that neither part can constitute a military danger to the other. Such is the solution that we offer of the Thracian problem. It is a partition. No partition, whether decreed in Silesia or anywhere else, ever excites much enthusiasm. Neither will this, but it is the best solution that in the circumstances we felt we could offer. It appeared to us to be consistent with justice and to bear in mind the stern and incontrovertible facts of the case. It is certainly a much better solution than, before I went to Paris, I was told from every quarter that I could hardly achieve.

There remained—and I apologise for keeping your Lordships so long, but I have to cover with such compression as I can, a really very vast field of study—there remained three questions which we discussed at some length. The first was the future of the armed forces of Turkey. We started by recognising the principle that we could not admit in any case that Turkey and Turkey alone of the enemy Powers in the recent war should be permitted to recruit her forces by conscription in the future. Conscription has been forbidden in the treaties to Germany to Austria to Italy and to Bulgaria. It could not of course be conceded to Turkey without entailing a demand which logically it would have been impossible to resist for the revision of all the other treaties in that respect. There were two other reasons. The retention of conscription in Turkey would have perpetuated an injustice to the non-Moslem populations of Turkey in the future, against whom the law of conscription has been wielded with most oppressive effect in the past. Further it would create injustice to the peasant population of Anatolia who have been constantly

drawn into the military ventures of Turkey in different parts of the East. At the same time, recognising the difficulty that might be found in constituting straight away a volunteer army in Turkey, we said that we should be prepared to consider with the Turkish Government in an amicable spirit a determination of the period within which the voluntary system of recruiting must be established in that country.

As regards the armed forces of Turkey in the future they will consist partly of gendarmerie and partly of certain special elements for the protection of the frontiers and otherwise. I can best state my case in figures. The Treaty of Sevres provided for a future Turkish force of gendarmerie of 35,000, and special elements 15,000 or a total of 50,000. The London Conference last year increased those figures to gendarmerie, 45,000 special elements 30,000, or a total of 75,000. This problem also we referred to the military authorities in Paris last week, and they unanimously recommended 40,000 or a total of 85,000 and they arrived at these figures on a consideration of the forces that had been allowed to other enemy Powers in the past. Further, they told us that they considered it would be adequate for the protection of the reconstituted Turkey of the future. In the organisation of the future, no doubt the Turks will find it desirable and, indeed, necessary, to apply to the Great Powers for the provision of European officers to assist in the organisation and instruction of those forces. Such assistance has already been rendered in the creation of such forces of gendarmerie as now exist in Turkey, and I have no doubt

that application will be made with regard to the larger force to which I have referred.

I am now, I think, covered the whole ground, and I am most grateful for your object for which I went to Paris, namely, the unanimous conclusion of the three Powers, proposals for the revision of the capitulatory régime in fiscal matters. These proposals provide for fiscal equality between foreign and Turkish subjects while safeguarding the former against excessive taxation and abuses in collection, and for any necessary modifications of the customs taxes with the consent of the Powers concerned. As regards the Capitulations in judicial matters, we repeat our offer made before to set up a similar commission to prepare a scheme of judicial reform to replace the capitulatory system, which will continue provisionally pending the introduction of the proposed scheme. This commission will be at liberty to recommend either a mixed or a unified judicial system.

I have now, I think, covered the whole ground, and I am most grateful for your object for which I went to Paris, namely, the unanimous conclusion of the three Powers, proposals for the revision of the capitulatory régime in fiscal matters. These proposals provide for fiscal equality between foreign and Turkish subjects while safeguarding the former against excessive taxation and abuses in collection, and for any necessary modifications of the customs taxes with the consent of the Powers concerned. As regards the Capitulations in judicial matters, we repeat our offer made before to set up a similar commission to prepare a scheme of judicial reform to replace the capitulatory system, which will continue provisionally pending the introduction of the proposed scheme. This commission will be at liberty to recommend either a mixed or a unified judicial system.

I have now, I think, covered the whole ground, and I am most grateful for your object for which I went to Paris, namely, the unanimous conclusion of the three Powers, proposals for the revision of the capitulatory régime in fiscal matters. These proposals provide for fiscal equality between foreign and Turkish subjects while safeguarding the former against excessive taxation and abuses in collection, and for any necessary modifications of the customs taxes with the consent of the Powers concerned. As regards the Capitulations in judicial matters, we repeat our offer made before to set up a similar commission to prepare a scheme of judicial reform to replace the capitulatory system, which will continue provisionally pending the introduction of the proposed scheme. This commission will be at liberty to recommend either a mixed or a unified judicial system.

I have now, I think, covered the whole ground, and I am most grateful for your object for which I went to Paris, namely, the unanimous conclusion of the three Powers, proposals for the revision of the capitulatory régime in fiscal matters. These proposals provide for fiscal equality between foreign and Turkish subjects while safeguarding the former against excessive taxation and abuses in collection, and for any necessary modifications of the customs taxes with the consent of the Powers concerned. As regards the Capitulations in judicial matters, we repeat our offer made before to set up a similar commission to prepare a scheme of judicial reform to replace the capitulatory system, which will continue provisionally pending the introduction of the proposed scheme. This commission will be at liberty to recommend either a mixed or a unified judicial system.

The Marquess of Salisbury. My Lords, I do not intend to make a speech. The very important statement to which we have listened requires very much more consideration than can be given to it as we listened to the noble Marquess, in order to enable us profitably to discuss it. I rise only for the purpose of putting a question

I did not understand that any definite arrangement has been come to by the noble Marquess and those with whom he acted, but that they handed over as it were, to the League of Nations the protection of the Armenians and their future fate. What I should like to ask is What procedure is it proposed that the League of Nations should pursue for the purpose of carrying out this obligation or mandate which has been given to them by the Powers at Paris? The League of Nations have, of course, no armed forces at their disposal. They are not, as I understand in a position to speak with authority, except in so far as they are supported by the action of the Powers which they represent. Of course, the noble Marquess is far more familiar with the Covenant of the League of Nations and its proceedings than I am, but I do not remember any procedure under that covenant by which there is an opportunity of bringing force to bear upon any recalcitrant Power except after agreement by the Powers concerned.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. My Lords, I should like to endorse what the noble Marquess, Lord Salisbury, has said. The anxiety with which we have all been awaiting the account which the noble Marquess promised us of the outcome of the proceedings at Paris has, I think, in the minds of many thousands of people, concerned itself chiefly with the question of the protection of minorities. There has been no doubt, and there is no doubt now, that the Conference has done much for many people with regard to the Dardanelles—a region which will have sacred conscription, with regard to Constantinople itself with regard to the Capitulations. Some of these results may be disappointing, but some of them, I think, will be satisfactory.

But I could not help feeling, as Lord Salisbury has just said, that we have passed the League of Nations is a very large phrase, and means a very large thing, and a power, not in Europe only, but throughout the world, in years to come. I have advocated it in many places on that ground. But when we are asked to consider the League of Nations as a mere matter, I agree with what the noble Marquess, Lord Salisbury, has just said as to our

We are in this matter, in England, pledged up to the hilt that something practical should be done. It is a little late to say, when it is so late, at moments and catastrophes here and, indeed, hardly fair after all that the noble Marquess has done, were we to manipulate simply the terms in which promises have been made, alike by the Prime Minister and the noble Marquess himself as representing the Foreign Office. We have been told, and the Armenians have been told again and again, that we might count upon this, that when the war was over they should, at all events, not be handed back again to the tender mercies of those who, for hundreds of years, have misused their powers to the extent that they have. I could quote many references, if it were necessary, but it is quite needless to call attention to them to-night. But when we say that this matter is now left to the League of Nations is it not really a kind of camouflage, a kind of screen to shield those who find it impracticable to fulfil the promises that they have made?—and I do not deny that it may be impracticable.

the practical harm of the disaffection which is encouraged by the idea that European power is behind those who are thus disaffected.

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. My Lords, the questions put by the noble Viscount are of a very different character from the questions which I have just asked, and I will endeavour to reply to them so far as I can. I would certainly deprecate any just interpretation, either of my remarks or of the spirit of our proposals in Paris, that might give rise to a misunderstanding on the part of the shoulders of the League of Nations, that we are proposing a mere camouflage to disguise our own incapacity. That is not my reading of the case nor do I think it is a fair interpretation of the situation. When the Powers met at the Conference of Versailles, when the supervision of those treaties was placed in the hands of the League of Nations, I do not remember either that the League of Nations accepted the responsibility, or that public opinion said, "Oh, the League of Nations has no forces with which to carry out the Treaty of Versailles." The League of Nations was created by the Treaty of Versailles, and it was the duty of the League of Nations to carry out the Treaty of Versailles.

[illegible]

attention of the Council of the League, should go before the Assembly of the League, representatives of the nations there collected. Those, my Lords, are all in the nature of guarantees. They are guarantees, in the first place, for local supervision, and, in the second place, for supervision by the public opinion of the world. They will be far more effective, I think, than anything proposed.

Then the most Rev. Primate says to me: "That is all very well, but in the last resort what are the forces—what are the armed forces—behind the League?" The armed forces did not prevent the League of Nations from having handed over to them the decision of the exceedingly vexed and difficult question of Silesia which the Powers were unable with their armed forces, to come to an agreement about. It did not prevent the League of Nations from undertaking an examination of that question, from arriving at a decision about it from declaring that decision to the two parties principally concerned, who were separated from each other by local differences quite as acute as any prevailing in Asia Minor, and it did not prevent that decision from being amply carried out, as it is being done at the present moment. Then the League of Nations had assigned to it a little time ago the question of the Åland Islands in the Scandinavian waters. That was a question upon which we were told Sweden and Finland were prepared to go to war, and that they were on the verge of hostilities. We referred it to the League of Nations. They had no troops to send there. They had no ships to navigate those waters. They had only the sanction of an absolutely impartial investigation, and the moral support of the public opinion of the world to the decision arrived at. After it had been arrived at what happened? Both parties, who had been at each other's throats, accepted the decision, and are loyally carrying it out.

Do not suppose that because the League of Nations has no armed forces that, therefore, even its physical influence is small. That is not the case. The influence of the League of Nations is, of course, in the first place moral, but the support of the public opinion of the world is in the nature of a physical sanction, very often more effective than that of arms itself. Let me put to the most Rev. Primate the alternative. If he says the League of Nations, for the reasons he indicated is rather an ineffective or powerless instrument to carry out its great purposes, what is his alternative? The only other alternative is the use of the armed forces of Europe. Does any man in this House really think that with the fullest desire to secure for the Armenians everything that we have ever and over again pledged ourselves to try to secure, France, or Great Britain or Italy is going to raise battalions here to send

their forces out of Cilicia. Are we to send forces to Erivan? No, everyone knows it is a thing that it is impossible to do. We have to face the conditions of the times. Within those conditions we have to be loyal to our pledges and to do what we can.

The plans that we have devised at Paris, let me remind the most Rev. Primate are not merely to be notified to the League of Nations, but they are to be embodied in the conditions we are sending to the Greeks and the Turks. They are part of the arrangements we are now proposing. These arrangements will I think if successfully carried out really give a much greater protection than the noble Marquess and I have been talking of. Instead of seeking the impracticable and the impossible as to concentrate on giving every possible support and authority that can be given to the League of Nations in accepting the invitation which we are about to address to them.

E 2775 900 44

No. 73

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Lord Hardinge (Paris).

(N. 14.)
Mr. and Mrs.

Foreign Office, April 1, 1922.

WITH reference to your dispatch No. 372 of the 12th February, I shall be glad if you will reply on the following lines to the note from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarding the French protectorate over Catholics in the East:

2. If His Majesty's Government have rightly interpreted this note, the French Government advance four distinct contentions:

(a.) The decisions of San Remo apply only to Palestine. France having never renounced, either at San Remo or elsewhere, the rights and prerogatives

which are recognised in her favour by international treaties in the territories submitted to the Sultan.

- (b.) The secretaries' notes of the San Remo Conference had not the value of official minutes, revised and signed by the parties concerned.
- (c.) The San Remo decision juridically does not become valid until the treaty with Turkey enters into force, although as regards Palestine the French Government have not insisted on the maintenance of the *status quo ante* in deference to the exercise of the British mandate.
- (d.) Even in Palestine the decision of San Remo only comprises the renunciation of civil, political and temporal privileges. Liturgical honours will continue to be paid to France as long as the Vatican desires, the Vatican alone being competent to modify existing practice in the matter.

In answer to these contentions I wish to make the following observations:

1. His Majesty's Government must adhere to their conviction that the renunciation of the French protectorate at San Remo applied generally to the East. While the discussion on that occasion arose on the concrete instance of Palestine, that debate took a general turn, and, as will be seen from p. 23 of the French text of the minutes, which purport to reproduce in *verbo* the speeches as delivered, and are in fact, have been taken in shorthand during delivery, M. Nitti summed up the discussion in the following:

"M. Nitti. Je crois qu'au fond nous sommes d'accord sur toutes les questions, mais il est opportun qu'il ne reste aucun malentendu. Il est bien entendu que la déclaration de M. Millerand, c'est-à-dire que le temps des privilèges est définitivement fini, doit être comprise dans ce sens. Il n'y aura plus aucune question de protection des Catholiques au Orient de la part d'une nation ou d'une autre et que les communautés religieuses ne pourront plus réclamer que leurs droits soient protégés plutôt par les représentants d'une puissance que par ceux d'une autre et qu'il n'y aura pas lieu à aucune réclamation contre les religieux qui ne rendront pas rendre les 'honneurs' à la nation qui les réclame."

"M. Millerand. Je suis d'accord."

The English text of the minutes is not quite so full, and summarises the speech in

Italian addition to the article, provided that the opening sentence with regard to the abandonment of the French religious privileges was not formally included. It was but was regarded as a binding pledge. For the rest the resolution of the conference speaks of the settlement of the question of the protectorate of the Holy See earlier in the afternoon by the recognition of this protectorate as being the policy of His Majesty's Government that, according to the resolution, the protectorate was general.

3. With regard to the contention of the French Government as to the validity of the documents containing the renunciation, His Majesty's Government would point out that it was out of deference to M. Millerand's express desire to avoid, for a formal and actual signing away of the French protectorate that the document was only recorded in the minutes of the conference, minutes which had been prepared in accordance with the usual and hitherto unquestioned procedure of the Supreme Council. M. Millerand himself admitted the binding character of the pledge thus given. Had the Allied Powers foreseen that doubt could afterwards be thrown on the decision on the ground that it did not figure in a signed document they would have been forced, however reluctantly, to insist on the signature of a separate instrument. In fact the insertion in the resolution of the conference (both French and English texts) of a definite undertaking as to the cessation of the French protectorate was not challenged at the time by the French Government, and, as far as His Majesty's Government are aware has not been challenged since until the receipt of the present French note.

4. For similar reasons His Majesty's Government regret that they cannot admit that the entry into force of the renunciation of the protectorate was in any way connected up with the entry into force of the treaty. As already explained, the renunciation was recorded in the minutes of the conference and in a phrase which unmistakably proved that it had come to an end from the date of that record. At the same time, while unable to admit the

juridical basis of the French argument, His Majesty's Government gladly recognise the fact that in 1919 the French Government, in the exercise of its right of disposal over Palestine, in a friendly desire not to make difficulties for the exercise of Great Britain's mandate

6. The French Government make a distinction between the political privileges and the ceremonial and liturgical privileges which follow from the protectorate. Such a distinction cannot be made. It is the duty of His Majesty's Government therefore to hold the French recognition of the cessation of their protectorate over Roman Catholics in Palestine and elsewhere to be absolute and complete and to cover all rights and privileges connected with it, and they cannot recognise the right of France to retain a ceremonial or liturgical precedence or other privilege of any kind in the East since the date of France's renunciation of her

has acquired in Turkish territory, through the good works and patient labours of her missionaries and teachers over a long period of time. His Majesty's Government warmly desire that the changed situation in the Turkey of to-day and in those

Jan &
PURDON OF NEWCASTON

E 3507/5 44.

No. 74

Minutes of the Fifth Meeting of Foreign Ministers at the Quai d'Orsay,
at 3.30 P.M. on 23.1.1952.

Present

For France	M Poincaré
				M de Peretti de la Rocca
				M Bargeton

For Great Britain	Marquess Curzon of Kedleston
	Mr R. G. Vansittart
	Mr E. G. Forbes Adam

For Italy Signor Schanzer
Marquis Visconti Venosta
Signor Guariglia

Interpreter, M. Camerlynok

Present at the discussion of the question of the dental-treated zone:—

Marshal Foch	General Sir C. H. G. G.
General Weygand	Colonel Heywood
General Gouraud	Colonel Heywood

4752189

Lord Curzon raised the question of the Straits. The Treaty of Sevres provided for a large zone to be created as a buffer between the British and French spheres of influence. Under that treaty the demilitarized zone consisted of the Gallipoli Peninsula, the Asiatic shore of the Dardanelles to an approximate depth of 60 miles inland, a strip of about

15 miles deep along the European shore of the Sea of Marmora, the European side of the Bosphorus to a depth of 3-50 fathoms, and in the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus the whole Ikonid Peninsula, and a strip of about 25 miles along the Asiatic shore of the Sea of Marmora, leaving Brusa outside the zone. The Marmora Islands and various islands in the neighbourhood of the Dardanelles in the

In March 1921, at the London Conference with the Turks and the Greeks the proposed demilitarised zone was reduced in favour of both the Turks and the Greeks. On the shores of the Dardanelles the zone was reduced within a line from the Bulvar lines to Rodosto, and on the other side to within a line from Tenedos to Karaghiza. In the case of the Bosphorus, the demilitarised area was reduced to a zone of 25 kilom. on either side of the Straits. The question which now arose related to the military occupation of the two sides of the Straits. If we were still to exercise some control of the Marmora and Bosphorus while giving up the actual supervision of the two shores of the Bosphorus, we must at least keep open the entrance into the waters of the Marmora through the Dardanelles.

It was vital for Great Britain that Gallipoli should not be returned to the Turks. He must recall that one of the main objects for which the Allies fought the war had been to prevent these waters being closed again by the Turks. Thousands of soldiers of the British army, men from Australia and New Zealand as well as England, had fought and died for this purpose and lay buried there. British public opinion would not permit the Straits to be closed again. This question was largely a military matter, and while British military opinion favoured generally the maintenance of the conventions as to the width of the demilitarised zones made to Turkey in March 1921, it strongly urged, in the case of the demilitarised zone on the Asiatic side of the Dardanelles, a return to the Treaty of Sèvres line, or alternatively to the frontier of the Çanakkale sanjak. This was indispensable for the safety of the Straits if the recognition of Turkish sovereignty throughout Anatolia was to involve the reappearance of the Turks on the Asiatic shore.

As to the garrisoning of the Straits, he would remind the conference that in their discussions of December last the British Government had suggested alternative methods of providing for the garrisoning of the Straits. Marshal Foch's view in 1920 had been that the minimum garrison which would be necessary was three battalions of infantry and two battalions of artillery. The question arose whether this force should be contributed and controlled by the Allies, or whether it should either now or later, be handed over to the League of Nations. He, Lord Curzon, thought it might not be a bad idea to place the command of the Straits in the hands of an international instead of an inter Allied authority. The League of Nations might be asked either immediately or later to constitute a military body to control the northern shores of the Straits. They would constitute a force and invite the various Powers to contribute their quota and be responsible for the military freedom of the Straits. He wished, however, to make it quite clear that he was not dealing with the waters of the Straits and their supervision. These would be controlled by an entirely separate body, the Straits Commission. On that body, in addition to the Great Powers, Roumania and Greece, it had been agreed that Bulgaria, Turkey, and Russia might, at a later date, be represented. At the moment the only question was that of the military safeguards for the freedom of the Straits and the machinery to be set up for that purpose. These safeguards would be no menace to Turkey. Indeed, the object of the Straits clauses in the Sèvres Treaty was to make Constantinople unassailable by sea and to prevent its being blockaded or attacked unless the League of Nations had first acted in that behalf. He would in closing say to the opinions of his Allied colleagues on the suggestions which he had thrown out.

Signor Schunzer said that he understood the proposal was to leave Gallipoli to Greece, and to maintain the demilitarized zone on both sides of the Dardanelles.

In reply, M. Poincaré said that it was possible to have some other control than a Greek one for Gallipoli. For instance, international control by the League of Nations. He agreed, however, that the Conference should examine the questions exposed by Lord Curzon, and he entirely concurred with Lord Curzon as to the necessity of maintaining the freedom of the Straits and as to keeping the Turks out of Gallipoli, but the rest of the problem must be discussed. He understood that the Conference was not yet organized.

¶ Poincaré proposed to discuss the military question first. As he understood it, the only way to ensure the neutrality of the Rhine was to demilitarise the zone between the Rhine and the Moselle. The Moselle was to be demilitarised in the same way as the zone between the Rhine and the Moselle. The Moselle was to be demilitarised in the same way as the zone between the Rhine and the Moselle.

Lord Curzon said that he understood the demilitarised zone proposed in London last year, and which included these islands, was generally accepted by Marshal Foch and the other experts. There was, however, one point. In March last year it was not settled that the Turks were to be readmitted to full sovereignty over Constantinople. If this was now to be done, the British military authorities thought the demilitarised zone on the Asiatic shore of the Dardanelles ought to go back from the March 1921 line, a distance of another 40 miles.

Lord Carson explained that he understood the view of the British War Office to be that the British would not be able to see the German ships from the high ground south of the March 1921 line unless the demilitarised zone extended about 40 miles further back.

Lord Curzon feared he had not made himself clear. The proposals of March 1921 contemplated Allied garrisons on both the European and Asiatic shores of the Dardanelles. It was now desired to do all that was possible to conciliate the Turks, and accordingly the Allied forces were to be confined to the Gallipoli side, i.e., the Turks would be back at Chanak and would not be under any control by Allied troops. In return for this substantial concession to the Turks, we should demand a rather large zone than that laid down in London in 1921. The British military authorities decided the limit of the demilitarized zone to be the boundary of the sanjak which lay between the wider zone laid down in the Treaty of Syvres and marked on the map and the narrower zone of the March 1921 proposals.

Lord Curzon pointed out that the difference was that the Allied garrison was now to be only on the north side of the Straits and not on the south. Of course, if Constantinople was to be given back to the Greeks without any control then corresponding assurances would be necessary on both sides. It would not be possible, however, to have a demilitarized belt on both sides without some Allied garrison being present in the neighbourhood.

Lord Curzon pointed out that the question of sovereignty was not raised at present the only question was that of military control.

the sovereignty were Greek, he had no objection to having the same depth (so far as the Straits were concerned) as the Turkish side. He had no objection to the Straits being in the hands of the Allies, but he would like to hear the opinion of Marshal Foch as to placing an Allied garrison on the north side of the Dardanelles only. Would the Straits in that case be safe?

If Poincaré suggested that perhaps the garrison on the northern shore could look after the southern shore by means of aeroplanes.

Marshall Fock was uncertain about this. There was the question of expense in addition to that of practicability.

It pointed out that the League had no troops. France had tried for an inter-
national force at the Peace Conference but had failed. The League had no troops.
It might be feasible to say that the three Allies would occupy the northern
shore until the day when the League of Nations was ready to take over.

They were under the command of France and the
If the League went round asking its members to con-
tributions, Russia, etc., would all ask to contribute.
If the United States would accept them as Associated
States, they would not ask for anything.
The forces of the three Allies

Lord Curzon thought there was much force in this observation but the United States were receiving their troops in the Balkans, and would not want to send them to the Dardanelles. If the three Powers were ready to stay there well and good but he wished to look ahead. His prophecy was that in five years or so the Allies would want to take away their troops and would apply to the League. In the mean time, however, he accepted M. Poincaré's view.

Signor Schuster said that in Italy public opinion was already preoccupied with the question of the League. He would have preferred the liberation without an Allied garrison and with the intervention of the League.

Marchal took thought that the proposal might prove feasible if there were no
in the neighbourhood but if there were the [redacted] which [redacted]

if between Turkey and Greece—
-then they might have a garrison
Otherwise it would not be worth

It was better to go back to the original proposal and trust to the Allied garrison. Possibly after an interval of time it would be necessary to apply to the League.

[illegible]

Lord Curzon said that he attached great importance to Marshal Foch's opinion, but the question was in the main political and should not be treated solely as a military one. He would be glad to have, however, what Marshal Foch had to say.

Marshal Foch said that Thrace would be difficult to support by itself if left in the hands of the Greeks. It would be difficult for the latter to hold it against Bulgaria. Again, it would be difficult for the Greeks to hold it against the Turks and that raised the question of the freedom of the Straits. Thrace, as a whole, raised the question of the demilitarised zones. He feared that if the Greeks remained in Thrace, it would be difficult to demilitarise the Turkish side. He had prepared a paper on the question.

Lord Curzon asked that the political question should first be discussed, and after that the military one.

M. Poincaré agreed to this.

The military experts then withdrew.

Lord Curzon then took up the question of Thrace and referred to his paper of 1921. He said that the Chatalja lines formed the only effective line of defence, but as the Turks said that the Chatalja line menaced Constantinople, he had suggested the Midia-Rodosto line. In reply, the French Government, in their note of the 27th January, had suggested the line Topanusu Maritsa Kuleh Burgas Rodosto. This left to the Greeks the whole of the area west of Rodosto and south of the railway up to the borders of Western Thrace. He was therefore surprised to hear the argument that the question to be dealt with related only to the country east of the French line.

M. Poincaré said that Lord Curzon had correctly explained the position. When the Turks would not accept this line, or that Marshal Foch had objections on military grounds, an indiscretion at Constantinople relating to the question of the boundaries of Thrace had showed what the Turkish view was. The chief consideration was that this line was dangerous from the point of view of peace. If the Greeks kept Gallipoli, it would be difficult for them to defend Thrace.

M. Poincaré then read Marshal Foch's opinion which was in favour of the Midia line with Turkey to the south of it and a buffer State to the north. Greece and Turkey were all mixed up in Thrace, and Adrianople was difficult for anyone of them to hold.

Signor Schanzer thought that the Greek view must be treated with sympathy, but thought they must also consider the question of the Straits, and the position of Constantinople as the home of the Caliphate and the capital of Turkey. We must, therefore, give the Turks real protection over Constantinople otherwise an impulse might be given to the Kemalist movement. He therefore suggested that the frontier should be pushed in the direction of Uzun Kupreui so as to set the frontier further from Constantinople. If the Greeks were left with everything up to the Rodosto-Midia line, they would be in danger between the Turks and the Bulgars. It would perhaps be desirable to hear the military view.

Lord Curzon said that M. Poincaré's argument placed him in a position of some difficulty. He had thought that the French view was that the frontier should be that laid down in their note of the 27th January, 1921. He thought that frontier a bad one, but was prepared to consider it. It now appeared that the French proposed a line further north. He took leave to remind M. Poincaré of what he had just said about the League of Nations. What Government was going to be set up? How was the region to maintain itself? (There was only one town of any size.) What would be the future of this entire area, extending to the zone of the Straits and Constantinople, had been under examination. President Wilson had favoured the creation of such an autonomous State, but it was out of the question to ask the League to accept the charge of administering the attenuated area now proposed.

There was another point of view to be considered, namely that of Greece. We

were going to ask the Greeks to withdraw their army with 50,000 bayonets from Asia Minor, and to give up all claims to Smyrna. The Greeks were our Allies, the Turks were our enemies, and had caused enormous sacrifices to all the Allies. The Greeks really deserved some consideration. Were we really to accept the dictation of Mustafa Kemal? Further, how was it proposed to carry out the proposal? If the Turks possessed military superiority in Asia Minor, the Greeks had it in Thrace. It was all very well to draw the Enos-Midia line, but the Greeks would snap their fingers at it. A good deal had been said of the danger to Constantinople, and that point was worthy of examination. But how was it proposed to turn the Greeks out of Thrace altogether? Outside Constantinople there were only a few Allied troops in the Straits zone, and we did not want to go to war with Greece.

There was another important aspect of the question. The Allies had tried laboriously since the war to establish a Balkan equilibrium. Would Roumania welcome the proposed solution? Would Bulgaria leave the suggested buffer State alone with the Greeks remaining in Western Thrace, as the French Government still proposed? There would be a Balkan war. Again, they should look at the question of population. M. Poincaré had spoken of not putting the Armenians in places where they were in a minority. The question of population had been argued *ad nauseum*. There was no doubt that before the Balkan wars the Greeks were in a majority in

maps published in the atlas prepared by the Bulgarian Minister at Berlin, the latter, they were not wholly impartial. Then came the Balkan wars in the course of which as also in the late war deportations of Greeks by the Turks had taken place on an enormous scale. Since then there had been partly Allied and afterwards Greek occupation. The Greeks had come back and the Turks had either left or been deported and to-day there was believed to be a Greek majority again in that area. Again,

the Turks back on the Northern shore of the Dardanelles and the Sea of Marmara. If this were the idea, his country and Government would never accept it.

M. Poincaré said that he had already explained why he had now dropped the proposal of the 27th January, 1921. He did not think he could be held to be bound to a particular view. They were all seeking a solution everything was in a state of flux. In 1912, at the London Conference, the Greeks, the Serbs and the Bulgars all claimed Macedonia and Western Thrace. On grounds of population M. Poincaré thought it useless to settle the question statistically. He had before him a Turkish map showing the population of Eastern Thrace as 900,000 Moslems and also the properties of Moslems. From this it was clear that Thrace was overwhelmingly Turkish.

Lord Curzon intervened to point out that his case had rested upon Turkish official statistics, and not upon propaganda figures.

M. Poincaré thought that not much importance could be attached to figures. The real question was a military one. Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece and Russia all desired Constantinople, and it was necessary to defend the city against them other wise there would be a big war in the East. He remembered M. Venizelos telling him that the Greeks always thought of Constantinople. It was necessary to set up something stable in the East and not something which would lead the Greeks to attack Constantinople. He proposed that they should hear the military authorities.

Lord Curzon said that he was quite ready to hear them, but he must observe that M. Poincaré was advancing a very serious proposition. A year and a half ago the Greeks had been asked to withdraw from Asia Minor, and no question of the danger to Constantinople had then been raised. (Lord Curzon) was unable to understand these sudden changes. He again asked his question. Would the Allies be prepared to accept the Enos-Midia line and the buffer State? The Greeks would rather leave Asia Minor in humiliation than abandon Eastern Thrace. But who was going to turn them out? Great Britain would not assist in the operation. Were France and Italy going to undertake it?

M. Poincaré said that he was not prepared to accept the Enos-Midia line. Advantages were conceded to M. Venizelos, but the return of Constantinople had created

a new situation. He agreed that it was necessary to find a solution which was acceptable to both sides without thinking of coercing either. It was not an easy task.

Lord Curzon said that it was not a question of individuals, of kings or premiers, of the Greeks. He (Lord Curzon) did not wish to see Greece at Constantinople and did not think she would get there, but her ambitions lay that way, and it was now proposed at a blow to destroy for ever her aspirations. The result would be that the Greeks would fight on.

M. Poincaré pointed out that when two or three people had the same aspirations of the ambitions of these Powers, everybody had been content before the war to have Turkey at Constantinople. Whoever installed himself at Constantinople would have other Powers against him, we must not, therefore, give the Greeks an opportunity to think of obtaining Constantinople.

Lord Curzon said that if what M. Poincaré had said about the aspirations of Bulgaria to Constantinople was true, did he not think that the proposed buffer State with Adrianople in it would lead to attack by Bulgaria? Would not the buffer State also be open to attack from Turkey and Mustafa Kemal particularly in the present mood? In order to keep the Greeks from Constantinople the only proposal put forward was to set up a sham buffer State. The buffer State would never be a satisfactory method of defending Constantinople.

M. Poincaré agreed that the buffer State might not be the best solution, but it was very difficult to find a good solution in a district with a population so racially mixed. The Conference had, however, to find some means of defending Constantinople.

Lord Curzon said that he thought the way to do this was to draw the frontier some way further back from Constantinople than the Chataltja line, or to create a larger demilitarised zone.

(The Conference then adjourned for a quarter of an hour.)

On resuming Marshal Foch, General Goutaud, General Weygand, General Sir C. Harington, Colonel Heywood and General Mariotti, were present.

Eastern Thrace and the Demilitarised Zone

Marshal Foch, who was asked to state his views, said that the only possible frontiers in Eastern Thrace were the Chataltja line, the Midia-Rodos line, the Enos-Midia or the Maritza. If the frontiers were Enos-Midia or Midia-Rodos, the Greeks and the Turks would be in contact along comparatively long stretches, and it would be difficult to stop them fighting or to provide effectively for the demilitarisation of the Straits zone. With Gallipoli under Greek sovereignty and the Greek troops in the proximity, they would always be a danger to an Allied garrison. If Gallipoli were given to Turkey and Greece placed north of the Enos-Midia, the Turks and the Greeks would be in contact at both ends of the Straits, with a possibility of fighting opening at any moment. It was for this reason that he had proposed to separate Greece from Turkey by a buffer State. If, however, political considerations would have to be found but the difficulty would always remain of the Turks and the Greeks being in contact along the Straits zone. The only way to defend Constantinople. He had not yet consulted his Allied colleagues.

Lord Curzon said that he would first like to ask one or two questions. Marshal Foch had said that it would be difficult to maintain Allied troops in Gallipoli if it were under Greek sovereignty. He (Lord Curzon) would ask the Marshal how it would be possible to maintain troops there if the sovereignty were Turkish.

Secondly, Marshal Foch had emphasised the danger to Constantinople from a Turkish advance without actually expelling the Greeks from Eastern Thrace. It must be remembered that the Greeks were in the Maritza zone, and that the Turks were in the Enos-Midia zone.

Western Powers who had strong navies. If Greece in Thrace was ever a menace or a danger, Allied ships could always be sent to the Piræus and threaten to bombard Athens.

There was another aspect of the question to which he would invite Marshal Foch's attention. The Greco-Turkish frontier had been placed at Chataltja, 30 miles from Constantinople, then it had been moved back to Midia-Rodos (about 80 miles). It was now stated that neither distance was far enough to make Constantinople safe. He (Lord Curzon) had understood that Chataltja was a very defensible line and, in his opinion, it was a very good line. He was not an expert on this essentially military question, and as to the number of the miles of plain which it was desirable to place between Constantinople and the Turco-Greek frontier. The question of establishing a buffer State, which had been raised by Marshal Foch, raised many difficulties by no means of a military nature, and he feared that no solution would be found in that direction. For the rest he trusted that it would be borne in mind that Greece was, in fact, in occupation of Eastern Thrace and that if it were decided that she should leave, as the Marshal had suggested, her troops would have to be turned out. How could such action be defended or carried out?

Marshal Foch referred to Lord Curzon's first question. He thought that the answer was that we were going by the treaty to impose control over the Turks in the Straits area, and we were also going to disarm Turkey. As long as Gallipoli was in Greek hands, it would be difficult to demilitarise the area.

Lord Curzon pointed out that there was general agreement already that if Gallipoli were Greek there should be the same extent of demilitarised zone on both sides of the Dardanelles. He said that it was in any case far from certain that we were going to disarm the Turks to any great extent. How was disarmament in fact, to be carried out? He would recall that the French Government, in their recent treaty of Sèvres, and the continuance of conscription.

M. Poincaré observed that the French Government had modified their view about their note. The Allies were going by some means or other to secure the demilitarisation of Turkey, but with a common Greek and Turkish frontier there would always be a danger of fighting, and we must try and avoid increasing the Greek appetite in the direction of Constantinople, which it was in the interests of the Allies to defend.

Marshal Foch then referred to Lord Curzon's second question as to the possibility of restraining the Greeks from attacking Turkey. He pointed out that Chataltja was no longer a military frontier because it was within cannon-shot of Constantinople. The minimum distance of the frontier, from this point of view, would give Midia-Rodos. He suggested that it might be preferable to put the frontier further back, namely, to Enos-Midia, in order better to defend Constantinople.

Lord Curzon enquired whether the alternative lay between Midia-Rodos or Enos-Midia. Would not the latter line be purely artificial with no geographical or ethnographical advantages? Geographically and ethnographically the Midia-Rodos line was a very good line. He would not raise that question at the moment as he had already explained the very grave objections to it. But he would ask Marshal Foch whether, from the point of view of the danger of allowing the Greeks and Turks to confront each other along a stretch of frontier, the Enos-Midia line, which was twice the length of the Midia-Rodos line, would not be vastly the more dangerous.

Marshal Foch said that he had only given general indications of his views, and that he would like to study the question of how best to find a frontier which would keep the Greeks the proper distance from Constantinople. The difficulty, however, remained, that there could be no cessation of fighting so long as the Greeks and Turks confronted one another. Whatever the frontier were the Allies would remain confronted with this difficulty in endeavouring effectively to demilitarise the northern shores of the Straits waters.

Lord Curzon enquired whether, supposing the Enos-Midia line were accepted and Gallipoli and the northern shores of the Marmora returned to Turkey, the Allied troops would be stationed at Gallipoli and Rodosto, or would the Turks be allowed to take their troops back to the north of the Straits? He was anxious to find out the real military opinion on this point.

Signor Schanzer observed that the Allies had two aims, namely, to protect Constantinople being attacked by the Greeks, and not to leave the northern shores of the Dardanelles and the Sea of Marmora in the hands of the Greeks. These two objects must be considered.

Marshal Foch thought that the only way of preventing the Turks menacing the freedom of the Straits was to remove the Greeks from that area, but he would like to study the question further.

M. Poincaré enquired whether Lord Curzon would have any objection to the demilitarisation of both sides of the Greek-Turkish frontier under the eyes of the League of Nations.

Lord Curzon said he would have none if means could be found to enable the League of Nations to attain that object.

M. Poincaré thought that it might be possible to arrange this, but the difficulty really was that if the whole of Eastern Thrace was demilitarised, which would be the best solution, Bulgaria, with an army much reduced but still large, would be a threat to Thrace.

At this point General Harington expressed the view that the Allies should not be too hasty in accepting the Enos-Midia line. He said that the Enos-Midia line was a good frontier, as it was too close to Constantinople. For the practical purposes of the present discussion, however, the Maritsa, as a frontier, was too far from Constantinople. With reference to Lord Curzon's question as to how far the frontier should be pushed back from the Chatalja lines, he thought that the Midia-Rodosto line would be far enough, and it would give the Turks time to defend themselves by pushing troops up from Chatalja or Constantinople.

For the rest, General Harington thought that it was essential that we should be fair to the Greeks, and that it must be remembered that in the last resort we could always keep them under control by pressure from the sea.

M. Poincaré said that the Allies should now examine the question of a suitable frontier.

Lord Curzon said that he was in favour of the Enos-Midia line, but thought that before the military experts examined the question a political decision should be reached as to the frontier desired.

General Gouraud also agreed with the views expressed by General Harington and General Marietti, but he suggested that Lord Curzon's object might best be achieved by a buffer State.

M. Poincaré, in reply to General Gouraud, briefly reviewed the various proposals already stated.

Lord Curzon said that it was necessary to draw distinctions between a neutral zone and a buffer State. The latter was, in his opinion, impossible for the reasons which he had already given and which M. Poincaré had correctly summarised. He understood that Marshal Foch and the Allied Military Advisers were to examine the question of a neutral zone, but not of a buffer State.

General Gouraud admitted that a neutral zone, which provided for the absence of Greek and Turkish soldiers, would suffice.

Signor Schanzer then suggested that the frontier might run from the Maritsa to the Black Sea, and that the neutral zone should be on the Greek side of the frontier.

Lord Curzon said that he would first like to put one question to Marshal Foch and that was, What steps were the three Allies to take to force Greece to retire from Eastern Thrace if the buffer State were not agreed?

Marshal Foch said that it was impossible for the Allies to force the Greeks to take this step.

M. Poincaré agreed, but said that he would make the same reservation as regards Turkey.

The military advisers then withdrew to consider the question of the frontier and the neutral zone in the sense of the Enos-Midia line.

Communication to the Press

The conference agreed on the following communication to the press:—

"The three Ministers for Foreign Affairs have examined the question of the frontier between Greece and Turkey. They have been assisted by Marshal Foch, General Gouraud, General Sir C. Harington and General Marietti, to whom they have referred the examination of certain military aspects of the question."

Armenia

M. Poincaré said that he had received a letter from the Armenian community, which corroborated his point of that morning that they really desired a frontier between Greece and Turkey.

Lord Curzon stated that he also had received a letter from representatives of the Armenians now in England, which equally spoke of their aspirations for a home in the south of Asia Minor.

It was decided to make no communication to the press on the question of Armenia, and it was not intended to disclose these until a general communication was made to the Greeks and the Turks.

It was, however, decided to add to the above communiqué the following:—

"At their meeting in the morning, M. Poincaré, Lord Curzon and Signor Schanzer began the study of the financial questions, and have charged their experts to elaborate certain points."

Signor Schanzer then raised the question of the meaning of the phrase in the armistice terms proposed to the Greeks and the Turks, "no movement of troops," and asked whether it was to be understood as meaning that no units were to move any units from their front during the armistice. He understood that Marshal Foch, to whom General Marietti had referred the point, had informed him that he (Signor Schanzer) had correctly interpreted the meaning of this clause.

It was decided to consider the matter further in the morning, as it was uncertain whether the Greeks and the Turks would accept the proposed terms.

(The meeting then adjourned.)

Minutes of the Sixth Meeting of Foreign Ministers, 1922, at 10:30 A.M., March 25, 1922.—(Received at Foreign Office, April 3.)

Present

For France ..	M. Poincaré M. de Peretti de la Rocca M. Bargeton
For Great Britain	Marquess Curzon of Kedleston Mr. R. G. Vansittart Mr. E. G. Forbes Adam
For Italy ..	Signor Schanzer Marquis Visconti-Venosta Signor Guariglia

Interpreter, M. Camerlynck

Present at the discussion of the question of Eastern Thrace.—

Marshal Foch	General Sir C. Harrington
General Weygand	Colonel Herwood
Colonel Georges	General Marietti

Present at the discussion of the question of Turkish finance.—

Mr. Armitage Smith	M. Loxton
Sir Adam Black	M. Nogués
M. des Clozières	

Armenia.

M. Poincaré opened the proceedings by raising the question of procedure in the case of Armenia. He suggested that it would be better to refer it specifically to the Council of the League than to the Assembly. It would receive more careful consideration in the former case.

Lord Curzon pointed out that all similar communications made by the Supreme Council previously to the League of Nations had been sent to the Council, and not the Assembly, and that the latter only met once a year. It was therefore in accordance with precedent and expediency to refer the question to the Council.

This was agreed to.

Finance.

At the request of M. Poincaré, M. des Clozières read the recommendations of the financial experts (see Annex 1), and explained briefly the system on which the experts had conducted their deliberations, namely, to outline the general principles of a settlement and to avoid, as far as possible, the question of details, on which there might still be differences of opinion when the principles were elaborated into a treaty. The essential thing was that the experts had agreed to a number of concessions to be made to Turkey.

Signor Schanzer said that he accepted the general lines of these proposals, but he would like the three Foreign Ministers to agree upon another article which was to be added to the Tripartite Agreement to harmonise with the general financial recommendations, and provide for the contingency of the Liquidation Commission

coming to an end at an early date. He had prepared a formula, which he submitted to the conference (see Annex 3).

provided by the Debt Council and the Commission of Liquidation. He quite agreed that Signor Schanzer's point as to the clause regarding concessions was important, but it was subordinate to these general considerations.

M. des Clozières explained that the experts had unanimously agreed that, in the circumstances, the Debt Council should be retained as under the decree of M. Loxton. He added that the experts had also agreed that the Liquidation Commission was only intended to last until the Allied war debt was liquidated. If that happened soon, it would be necessary to provide for the contingency which Signor Schanzer's second proposal (see Annex 3) was intended to meet.

With reference to Lord Curzon's point regarding the preamble, the experts had intended this to be an indication of their views to the conference, not to be pushed outside. For the rest, under their proposals, the Liquidation Commission was only intended to last until the Allied war debt was liquidated. If that happened soon, it would be necessary to provide for the contingency which Signor Schanzer's second proposal (see Annex 3) was intended to meet.

M. Poincaré pointed out that it might be necessary, when the clauses were elaborated, to change the words "pounds sterling" to "gold francs."

Lord Curzon enquired whether the experts thought that an early execution of their recommendations, if embodied in the new treaty, was possible as long as two Governments existed in Turkey.

M. des Clozières agreed that unification of the two Governments was essential before the financial clauses could be executed.

Lord Curzon then referred to article 6 of the National Pact, and enquired whether the financial experts thought that, in principle, and from the point of view of that article, their recommendations would prove acceptable to Turkey.

M. des Clozières said that he thought they should. He added, in reply to an enquiry from Signor Schanzer, that he thought the new formula proposed by the Italian Government regarding concessions (see Annex 2), which return no veto, might also, under certain circumstances, be accepted by Turkey.

The financial recommendations of the Allied experts were adopted. A discussion then followed on the two articles proposed by Signor Schanzer (see Annexes 2 and 3).

M. Poincaré said that he saw no objection, in principle, to the article to be added to the Tripartite Agreement as proposed, and that it should be submitted to Turkey.

He thought, however, that the formula proposed for the article regard-
in the new treaty should be more attenuated in drafting. For instance, Turkey would
never accept the imposition of permanent representatives attached to the department of
Turkish Government concerned with concessions.

Signor Schanzer pointed out that his formula was considerably weaker than
of the Treaty of Sèvres. With their experience of Turkish admin-
it was essential to bind the Turkish Government down in its relations with the commis-
sion on the question of concessions.

M. Poincaré then raised the question of the number of representatives to be
attached to Turkish departments by the Liquidation Commission under Signor Schanzer's

Signor Schanzer explained that it was intended only to appoint one representative
who would be responsible for a liaison with all the departments concerned. When the
financial clauses were elaborated in the final treaty, it would probably be provided also
that the Commission de Liquidation should appoint the controller of the Turkish
customs, and perhaps of some other Turkish services, as in the Treaty of Sèvres.
There would be good reason for this, because it was proposed that the Turkish Govern-

The control was absolutely essential in order to prevent the Turkish Government from
the Commission of Liquidation to the Turkish Ministry of Public Works, the Allies
would have no say whatever in the matter of concessions, and this was in the interest of
neither Turkey nor of the Allies.

M. Poincaré pointed out that there was general agreement as to the first paragraph
must maintain that the Allies should not try to impose upon Turkey a permanent
control over her public services, which seemed to be suggested by that paragraph.

Lord Curzon suggested that there was some misunderstanding as to the intention
of the second paragraph. He thought Signor Schanzer had intended, not several
of the Turkish Government who were concerned with the concessions.

M. Poincaré agreed, but thought the point might be met by a redraft, which would
attain, in an attenuated form, the object desired by Signor Schanzer.

After some discussion the formula was agreed to, subject to the proviso that in the
substituted for the words "soumettra à," and that in the second paragraph the words "Le
Gouvernement ottoman devra en outre donner à la commission et à ses représentants
l'accomplissement de sa mission auprès des admini-
substituted for the words "Le Gouvernement ottoman

Annex B

Lord Curzon said he had no objection, in principle, to signing this agreement, but
in mind that the Allies had no right and no power to insist upon Turkey granting
concessions to one or other of them. The Tripartite was only binding as between the
Powers themselves.

Further discussion of the article and its signature was deferred until the afternoon
meeting.

Thrace

At this stage the military experts, who had arrived at a decision regarding the
frontier in Thrace, entered the room.

Marshal Foch explained briefly the frontier between Greece and Turkey in
Eastern Thrace, which the Allied military experts recommended in accordance with the

views expressed by the three Foreign Ministers on the previous day. The line which
they suggested would start from a point just east of the Gallipoli Peninsula near Ganos
and west of Rodosto, and then run north east of the Maritsa to the west of the towns
of Baba Eski and Kirk Kili to the Bulgarian frontier in the neighbourhood of the
Stranja mountain range. Both sides of this frontier would be demilitarised, and in
the district round Adrianople itself Greece would be allowed to retain troops in order
that she would be able to defend the western half of Eastern Thrace, which she was to
retain against Bulgaria. Under this plan Rodosto would become Turkish, and the
Greek territory west of the Greco-Turkish frontier would then be separated from its
port. This raised an economical question, which the military experts were not
competent to decide.

In reply to an enquiry by Lord Curzon, he added that it was intended to
divide equally the whole of Turkish Eastern Thrace and the whole of Greek
Eastern Thrace, except her special area round Adrianople, left as a defence against
Bulgaria.

Lord Curzon thanked Marshal Foch and the military experts for their careful
study of this question. He understood the military reasons which had led the experts
to choose this line, but he must point out that the surrender to Turkey of Rodosto
which might become valuable as a port and which had been given to Greece under the
Treaty of Sèvres—might well cause a grievance to the Greeks, analogous to that already
caused to Bulgaria by the loss of Dobrujatch.

The second criticism which he had to make was
Marshal Foch left two important towns (Baba Eski and Kirk Kili) in the hands of
Adrianople, to take away from them these two important towns with a considerable
Greek population.

His third point was that genuine hostility between Bulgaria and Greece, owing to
past history in the Balkans, existed, and would probably continue to exist in that part
of the world. There was a real danger in the continuous intrigues between Bulgaria
and Turkey, both anxious to drive Greece respectively from Western and Eastern
Thrace. It seemed to Lord Curzon, therefore, that it was essential to reduce the
common Turco-Bulgarian frontier as much as possible.

There was a last point to which he would draw attention, and that was the question
of railway connection. The transcontinental line from Adrianople to Constantinople
would pass from Greek into Turkish territory in the neighbourhood of Baba Eski, but
there was no railway connection between Western Thrace and the area between the
Maritsa River and Rodosto, which was the natural easterly debouchure of this area. If
Rodosto were left to Greece, a line would probably soon be built running from Rodosto
to the nearest point on the Adrianople-Constantinople Railway at Muradli. He under-
stood that this could easily be constructed if the funds were forthcoming.

To sum up, he thought that the objections he had raised could be met by leaving
Rodosto on the Greek side of the new frontier and making the latter go east of the
Baba Eski and Kirk Kili, so as to join the Bulgarian frontier in the Stranja
Rodosto would be in the demilitarised zone, and no Greek warships would be
allowed there under the Straits provisions of the Treaty of Sèvres which, in essentials,
would be presumably maintained. Greek administration at Rodosto could, in itself,
be no danger to Turkey.

M. Poincaré admitted that there was force in Lord Curzon's arguments, but
the proposal of the military experts, to prove a danger to Greece. If the Greek
Bulgaria were prolonged, as Lord Curzon had suggested, Greece might
find it disadvantageous to have so long a stretch to defend. For the rest, he did not
think that the economic argument regarding the Greek area in Rodosto could be pressed
very far. In leaving Adrianople to Greece we were really doing something disadvantageous
to Turkey, all the more that Adrianople was, in some sense, a holy city. The Allies
would find difficulty in imposing the treaty in any case, and must make their proposals
as acceptable as possible.

Lord Curzon agreed that we had to make our proposals as acceptable as possible to
both parties, but the Allies must also bear in mind that the Greeks were now in
complete occupation of Eastern and Western Thrace and of the towns which the
military experts now proposed to cede to Turkey. She had been given to believe that,

even if the Sèvres frontier were modified, she would receive something like the M Rodosto line. If she were now asked to yield more territory and at the same time were told to evacuate completely Asia Minor with no special régime for Smyrna, she would then find themselves in the position of being unable to enforce their demands on Greece.

If Poincaré pointed out that as Lord Curzon had himself said the day before, Greece could be coerced, as a last resort, only by Allied naval pressure at Athens.

Lord Curzon observed that he had used this argument, not in connection with enforcing unjust modifications of the Treaty of Sèvres upon Greece, but in connection with the possibility of a future attack by Greece upon Constantinople after the treaty was in force.

For the rest, he understood that M Poincaré had admitted that no forcible measures could now be taken by the Allies against either belligerent in so far as enforcing peace terms was concerned. He would now ask Marshal Foch whether a frontier of a less objectionable nature than that which he had sketched above could not be found.

Marshal Foch replied that he did not think the suggested east of Rodosto would be so strong, from a military point of view, as that proposed by the Allied military experts. They had specially looked for high ground, and the new line would be mostly in flat country and would require troops to defend it. This observation applied to the Rodosto end of the line.

Lord Curzon asked whether it would not be possible, leaving aside for the moment the question of Rodosto, to trace a new line up to the Bulgarian frontier on equally high ground but more to the east than the military experts had proposed.

Marshal Foch thought that it would be quite possible to do this.

General Maritz agreed, and suggested that the line proposed by the military northwards east of Kirk Kilisse to the Bulgarian frontier.

Lord Curzon suggested that the military experts might try and find a solution on

As to Rodosto, if it were to remain Turkish, Lord Curzon thought that the Adrianople-Constantinople Railway east of the new frontier should be given to Greece to enable her to use the port of Rodosto, and on any line or road which might be made from that railway to the port. Greece should, in fact, be given the special first, however like to know whether Rodosto was likely to develop into a port of importance and whether a railway could easily be built to the north of the town.

Colonel Georges agreed that "certain," agreed that develop a port at Rodosto to be his.

ANNEX 1.

Les circonstances actuelles ne permettent plus l'établissement d'un contrôle effectif sur les finances et l'administration ottomanes. Dans ces conditions, la création d'une commission financière qui ne posséderait que des pouvoirs insuffisants, et ne pourra, par conséquent, exercer qu'une action illusoire doit être abandonnée.

Il sera donc proposé une commission de contrôle soulever contre le Traité de Paix le nationalisme turc, les experts soussignés soumettent les propositions suivantes :

1. Il ne sera pas prévu dans le Traité de Paix un contrôle général sur les finances ottomanes.

2. Le décret de Monbarrem, les décrets annexes, ainsi que tous les contrats des emprunts énumérés à l'Annexe 1 des clauses financières sont confirmés.

3. Il sera tenu, cependant, compte des décisions du Traité de Versailles supprimant les légations allemandes et autrichiennes au conseil de la Dette publique.

4. Le principe des parts contributives à verser par les provinces détachées de l'Empire ottoman et leur mode de calcul sont maintenus.

5. Pour le règlement des frais d'occupation militaires des Puissances alliées depuis l'armistice jusqu'à la mise en vigueur du Traité de Paix et après la mise en vigueur du traité, ainsi que les réclanations des ressortissants alliés pour dommages subis antérieurement.

La Commission sera composée des représentants des trois principales Puissances alliées, qui aura les attributions plus loin.

6. La Turquie s'engage à verser à cette Commission de Liquidation pendant vingt années une annuité de 5,000,000l.* Toutefois, pendant les premières années, la commission aura le droit de ne réclamer à la Turquie qu'une somme de 3,000,000l par an, étant entendu que la différence entre la somme totale due par la Turquie, soit 5,000,000l, et ladite somme de 3,000,000l, sera répartie sur les années suivantes.

7. Pour assurer le paiement de cette annuité, le Gouvernement ottoman devra affecter irrévocablement en garantie les excédents constant blé, des revenus de la douane, de la dîme, et de l'agham, ainsi que la part du Gouvernement dans le produit des concessions existantes ou à créer.

8. La commission déterminera les moyens qu'elle jugera opportuns pour assurer la gestion des revenus donnés en gage.

ANNEX 2

Formula to replace Article 230 of the Treaty of Sèvres

Le Gouvernement ottoman soumettra à l'avis de la Commission de Liquidation, avant promulgation, les contrats des nouvelles concessions ou de prorogation des concessions existantes à accorder en faveur de ressortissants ottomans ou de tous.

Afin de permettre à la Commission financière d'accomplir la mission en conséquence de cause, le Gouvernement ottoman donnera toutes les facilités requises au représentant que la commission désignera auprès du Département ministériel compétent.

ANNEX 3.

Accord particulier.

(Annexe à l'Accord tripartite.)

Dans le cas où la Commission de Liquidation cesserait de fonctionner et avant la cessation de ses fonctions, les trois principales Puissances alliées se concerteraient sur les mesures à prendre pour assurer par d'autres moyens que ceux prévus au Traité de Paix avec la Turquie l'exécution de l'Accord tripartite ou ce qui concierne les concessions réservées à chacune desdites Puissances.

* Le montant de l'annuité ci-dessus sera partagé entre les trois Puissances conformément à ce sera mentionné ultérieurement dans elles sur la base des comptes présentés par chacune d'elles.

*Minutes of the Seventh Meeting of Foreign Ministers at the Quai d'Orsay
at 3 p.m., March 25, 1922.—(Received at Foreign Office, April 3.)*

Present

For France	M. Poincaré. M. de Peretti de la Rocca M. Bargeton
For Great Britain	Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. Mr R. G. Vansittart. Mr E. G. Fortes-Adam
For Italy	Signor Schanzer Marquis Visconti-Venosta. Signor Guariglia

Interpreter M. Camerlynck

There were also present for the questions of Eastern Thrace and the demilitarised

Marshal Foch	General Sir C. Harrington
General Gouraud.	Colonel Heywood
General Weygand.	
Colonel Georges.	General Mariotti

Greece and the Armistice.

Lord Curzon informed his colleagues that he had received a telegram from Athens which indicated that the Greek answer to the Allied proposals for an armistice would be favourable.

Italian proposal for an article to be added to the Tripartite Agreement

M. Poincaré referred to the Italian proposal for an article to be added to the Tripartite Agreement (Annex 3 to the Minutes of the Sixth Meeting), and suggested that the wording of the last phrase should run as follows:

"Les engagements pris par lesdites Puissances les unes vis-à-vis des autres en vertu de l'accord en date du 10 août 1920, dit Accord tripartite."

This wording was adopted, and it was agreed that the article should be signed at once in the form of a special agreement (see Annex 4).

M. Poincaré said that the questions still remaining to be discussed were Thrace, Smyrna, the military clauses, the Capitulations, and the Straits, which was still being examined by the military experts.

Lord Curzon explained that since that morning he had made further enquiries relating to the railway from Muradi to Iskender. In consequence of these enquiries, he was of opinion that it was essential to provide economic facilities for Greece in the port and on any railway or road that might be made to it. It appeared that Iskender had a trade of 1,000,000, per annum before the war.

Adrianople

M. Poincaré raised the question of Adrianople, and urged the necessity of special safeguards for the Moslem majority there.

Lord Curzon pointed out that when the conference was discussing the future of Smyrna he had raised the question of the necessity of a special régime for the Smyrna area, and M. Poincaré had raised objections to such a proposal. In view of the minority formula which had now been adopted, the necessity for a special régime for Smyrna had diminished, but it was impossible to legislate specially for Adrianople if they were not

to take similar action in the case of Smyrna. For the rest, he had recently received a letter from a British official which gave the present figures of the population of Adrianople as about 23,000 Greeks, 3,000 Moslems and 1,000 Jews, so it was probable that a Moslem majority existed to-day. Moslem rights, in relation both to political and to mosques, had been specially safeguarded in the Minorities Treaty with article 15 of which referred expressly to Adrianople.

M. Poincaré agreed that it was not necessary to do more for Adrianople than for Smyrna, but they might perhaps make it clear in the communication to the Turks that special arrangements were to be made for Adrianople.

Lord Curzon suggested that it might be better to wait until they could elaborate the terms of peace with the Turks and the Greeks. If necessary the same special régime, *mutatis mutandis*, could then be arranged for both Smyrna and Adrianople.

M. Poincaré agreed, but they must remember that the French Parliament might want to elaborate the provisions of the Greek Minorities Treaty, which was not yet ratified.

Lord Curzon said that he did not wish to exclude this possibility, but he would point out that the Greek Minorities Treaty contained very stringent provisions as to the protection of minorities, especially Moslem minorities, and the question as to how and to what extent special arrangements should be made for the protection and due representation of the different social and religious elements in Adrianople. This was a slight development of article 15 of the treaty.

to make special arrangements for the protection and due representation of the different social and religious elements in Adrianople. This was a slight development of article 15 of the treaty.

The following formula was finally agreed upon:—

"When the Treaty of Peace is drawn up, the three Powers will be ready to secure special protection and adequate representation for the different social and religious elements in the two towns of Adrianople and Smyrna."

Military Clauses and Conscription

Lord Curzon said that he had received a letter from the Turkish Government, dated March 22, 1922, in which they stated that they were prepared to accept the Allied proposals for an armistice, and that they were ready to discuss the military clauses of the Treaty of Peace. He said that he had discussed the question of conscription with Marshal Foch and his military experts, and that they had concluded that the Turkish Government's proposal to allow a certain interval of time before the abolition of conscription was to be completed, was reasonable.

of conscription in Turkey, he had, after discussion with Marshal Foch and his military experts, already yielded to Lord Curzon's reasoning. Any other course would certainly produce difficulties with Bulgaria. The Allies should consider the question of allowing a certain interval of time before the abolition of conscription was to be completed.

ensuring Turkey's acceptance) w

Turkey was permitted to retain. Under the Treaty of Sevres

all the elements of the army (gendarmes, &c.) was 50,000. At

in March 1921 it had been proposed to increase this number

increase might not be allowed. In both these

points of view, the Turkish Government's proposal was reasonable.

Lord Curzon said that he had discussed the question of conscription with Marshal Foch and his military experts, and that they had concluded that the Turkish Government's proposal to allow a certain interval of time before the abolition of conscription was to be completed, was reasonable.

ensuring Turkey's acceptance) w

Turkey was permitted to retain. Under the Treaty of Sevres

all the elements of the army (gendarmes, &c.) was 50,000. At

in March 1921 it had been proposed to increase this number

increase might not be allowed. In both these

points of view, the Turkish Government's proposal was reasonable.

ensuring Turkey's acceptance) w

Turkey was permitted to retain. Under the Treaty of Sevres

all the elements of the army (gendarmes, &c.) was 50,000. At

in March 1921 it had been proposed to increase this number

increase might not be allowed. In both these

points of view, the Turkish Government's proposal was reasonable.

ensuring Turkey's acceptance) w

Turkish gendarmarie schools, but not for foreign officers in the gendarmarie itself. These provisions might be maintained and Turkey left to ask for foreign officers if she officers on Turkey.

Lord Curzon wished to refer for the moment to the Angora Agreement. He had not specifically raised the point before, but he must in this connection refer to the exchange of letters between Yusef Kemal and M. Franklin-Bouillon. The former had said that he desired to have French specialist officers as instructors in the gendarmarie schools, and M. Franklin-Bouillon had acknowledged the letter. He, Lord Curzon, asked whether it was intended to send French alone, or French, Italian and British officers to the gendarmarie schools as instructors. He knew from his own experience that such instructors would really be officers who took the field with the gendarmarie itself and he asked whether that was what the Allies intended.

M. Poincaré said that M. Franklin-Bouillon had had a difficulty with the French Government and had explained both to that body and to himself that the Turkish Government were only willing to choose foreign officers themselves and only as instructors in the schools. These officers would only be employed for training purposes.

Lord Curzon enquired whether the Angora Agreement meant in fact a monopoly of French gendarmarie officers. It would appear that this was the case, in view of Colonel Sarrailh's reference to himself as head of the Turkish gendarmarie in Anatolia. He, Lord Curzon, would like to be clear as to how each Ally was to stand towards the others in this matter. Would each Ally provide officers on an equal basis? Though important, this matter was of less moment than the general question whether or not

M. Poincaré said that Colonel Sarrailh's position was quite independent of the Angora Treaty and was due to an anterior agreement. As regards the exchange of letters between Yusef Kemal and M. Franklin-Bouillon about the gendarmarie instructors, he assured Lord Curzon and Signor Schanzer that there was nothing in those letters contrary to the pledge given by France to Great Britain and Italy in the Sévres settlement. The matter would have to be made clear in the final treaty.

Lord Curzon thanked M. Poincaré for this assurance. He desired to point out that Colonel Sarrailh's present claim seemed to be an entirely novel one, and he had had difficulties with the Head of the Inter Allied Gendarmarie Commission and its French president, General Filonow.

For the rest, he (Lord Curzon) would like to be clear whether or not the Allies were really going to pursue an inter Allied policy with regard to these officers, and whether they were to be only instructors or really officers.

acting together, must secure in the final treaty what France had been promised at Angora.

Lord Curzon said that he understood M. Poincaré to have admitted three general points:

1. The Angora Agreement had been concluded, so far as the question of the gendarmarie was concerned, without the consent of the French Government. No claim was made by France for any monopoly or privilege of gendarmarie officers or instructors outside the French zone.
2. The question of providing such officers or instructors could only be resolved by a common inter Allied policy.

He suggested that the Allied military experts should now consider whether the general question of the attachment of foreign officers to the Turkish gendarmarie and other elements.

Demilitarisation of Anatolia.

[At this stage M. Poincaré read the decision of the military advisers as to the interpretation of the article in the armistice dealing with the removal of troops from the Italian front. Their interpretation of it was as follows:—

"Aucune unité tactique pourrait être enlevée pour être envoyée ailleurs."]]

Demilitarisation of Eastern Thrace.

General Weygand read article by article the proposals of the military advisers as to the demilitarisation of Eastern Thrace and the zone of the Straits (see Annex 2). He explained that the article intended to replace article 161 of the Treaty of Sévres referred only to the demilitarised zone as defined in article 172 of the Treaty of

Lord Curzon enquired whether the reference was to the larger zone of the Treaty of Sévres or to the smaller zone proposed in London in March 1921.

General Weygand explained that it was neither, it was the zone defined lower down in the proposals of the military advisers.

M. Poincaré said that there was a fault in the drafting; it should read "qui sont en avant occupés."

Lord Curzon asked why the words "gendarmarie under inter-Allied command" had been left out of paragraph 3 of article 178. He referred to the provision of the Treaty of Sévres which General Weygand had just read out.

General Weygand explained that they had been left out purposely. The Allies were only to control the effectives and not to command the gendarmarie, since there was to be no Allied force in the zone opposite Gallipoli.

Lord Curzon drew attention to the new concession which had been made to the Turkish Government in the new article 178 (3), namely, the permission to have a Turkish garrison at Constantinople as well as the Sultan's bodyguard, which was the only garrison allowed there under the Treaty of Sévres. He also wished to draw attention to the necessity of consulting the British Admiralty before the draft was finally inserted in the treaty. He must make full reservations on this point.

Thirdly, he understood that the Allied troops were to be reduced in numbers and stationed only in the Gallipoli Peninsula, but they would have to extend their supervision over the whole demilitarised zone. Would there be any confusion of powers between the Allied garrison of the Straits and any Allied troops left in Constantinople under the military clause, i.e., under the Commission of Organisation and Control?

M. Poincaré also enquired whether the garrison of the Straits would provide officers for the immunes at Constantinople.

General Weygand said that Lord Curzon's understanding of the proposed position was correct. He did not think any confusion of powers would arise, but the question of the position of the Allied officers was a matter to be dealt with in the military clause of the final treaty.

M. Poincaré then raised the question of the demilitarised zone. He thought that that zone should be the smaller area laid down in the London proposals of March 1921.

Lord Curzon pointed out that the question of the zone, as laid down first in the Treaty of Sévres and subsequently at London, had been modified by the decision of that morning, which demilitarised the whole of Eastern Thrace.

Signor Schanzer enquired whether the Allied garrison in Gallipoli was to look after the whole of the demilitarised area.

General Weygand said that the answer of the military advisers was in the affirmative, and that the Allied garrison would have a large staff and force.

Lord Curzon said that in that case the position would require careful consideration because if the numbers of the Straits garrison was to be increased in this way, the Gallipoli Peninsula would not be large enough and the Allied troops might have to go to Constantinople.

M. Poincaré agreed that this was a difficulty. The Allied troops must not go to Constantinople because the Turks would never agree to this. It would perhaps be better to let the troops leave Gallipoli, where, as Lord Curzon had pointed out, it might Rodosto, or withdraw them to the shores of the Sea of Marmara. He therefore suggested the insertion of the words "et sur la côte nord de la mer de Marmara jusqu'à Rodosto."

Lord Curzon thought that the inspecting officers attached to the Allied garrison of Gallipoli should also have the power to go to Constantinople. Both the Greeks and the Turks would be under the régime of demilitarisation.

M. Poincaré feared that in that case there would be a friction with the Turks, who would be a continual danger if Turkish pride were offended and if they were compelled to accept permanently Allied officers at Constantinople.

Lord Curzon said that there was no question of keeping the officers permanently at Constantinople, all that was proposed was that they should have the right to go there for purposes of inspection. For the rest, these officers should be entitled to go to Adrianople as well as to Constantinople.

M. Poincaré pointed out that Constantinople was a capital and a Holy City, while Adrianople was not important to Greece nor a Holy City for the Greeks.

Lord Curzon suggested that there were many other places which might be taken into consideration such as Thessalonica. It would be better to leave the matter vague.

It was decided to accept the proposals of the military advisers with the insertion of the words suggested by M. Poincaré "et sur la côte nord de la mer de Marmara jusqu'à Rodosto inclus."

Lord Curzon raised the question of the words in paragraph 7 of article 178 "dans la zone" was too long a

It was decided to change these words to "trois mois à partir de la mise en vigueur du présent traité."

With these changes the proposals of the military advisers (see Annex 3 for draft as adopted) were adopted.

It was then decided to refer to the military advisers the questions of conscription and of Allied officers for the Turkish gendarmerie.

The military advisers then withdrew.

Capitulations

Lord Curzon explained that his advisers had prepared a short draft covering the question of the modification in principle of the Capitulatory régime for insertion in the proposals to be made to the Turks and the Greeks. Before reading it, he would observe that the question of the Capitulations must be examined from the fiscal and judicial points of view. All necessary safeguards must be provided if the Capitulations were to be modified from either point of view. He wished to make a proposal which contemplated a large concession to Turkey, but, at the same time, would provide a means for securing the necessary safeguards.

Lord Curzon's proposal (Annex 4) was then read and its consideration adjourned until the next meeting.

Lord Curzon urged that on Monday next it would be desirable to publish to the world a communication giving the terms which the Allies had agreed to propose to the Greeks and the Turks. They would have to see how each side took this communication. One side or the other might be disillusioned, and it was therefore necessary to publish the Allies' own case, giving the reasons for which their proposals had been made and any necessary explanations. If this suggestion were accepted he would undertake to prepare a draft for submission to his colleagues to-morrow. Simultaneously the French Secretary might prepare the covering letter with which the formal proposals of the conference would have to be sent to both Greeks and Turks at the close of these

This proposal was agreed to.

Annex 1. Minute relating to the Straits and the financial clauses.

Annex 1.

Accord particulier.

Dans le cas où la Commission de Liquidation prévue au nouveau traité avec la Turquie cessait de fonctionner, et avant la cessation de ses fonctions, les trois

Pour les autres moyens que ceux prévus audit traité le respect des engagements pris par les trois Puissances alliées, en vertu de l'Accord tripartite du 12 août 1920, dit Accord tripartite.

POINCARÉ
CURZON OF KEDLESTON
SCHANZER

Paris, le 25 mars 1921.

Annex 2.

Propositions des Experts militaires au sujet des Dispositions concernant la Démilitarisation de la Thrace orientale et de la Zone des Détroits.

Ces dispositions sont indiquées ci-dessous sous forme d'articles à insérer dans le traité en remplacement des articles 161, 178, 179 et 180 du Traité de Sévres.

ARTICLE 161

Dans les territoires de la zone démilitarisée occupés par les Alliés et définie à l'article 178 du présent traité, les forces de gendarmerie helléniques ou ottomanes seront subordonnées au Commandement international d'Occupation de ces territoires.

ARTICLE 178

En vue d'éviter les contacts armés entre les forces turques et helléniques, et de garantir d'autre part la liberté des Détroits, les hautes parties contractantes conviennent des dispositions suivantes :

1. Dans le délai de trois mois à partir de la mise en vigueur du présent traité, il sera procédé au désarmement et au démantèlement de tous ouvrages, fortifications ou batteries dans une zone comprenant les territoires et les défilés à l'article 179 ci-après. Sont interdites dans ladite zone . . . (sans changement jusqu'à la fin du paragraphe de l'article 178 du Traité de Sévres).

2. Sans changement.

3. Les territoires et les lieux de la zone démilitarisée ne pourront être utilisés militairement, en cas de nécessité, que par les trois Puissances alliées ci-dessus visées agissant conjointement. Cette disposition n'affecte pas . . .

4. La Grande-Bretagne, la France et l'Italie, agissant conjointement, auront la faculté d'exercer la surveillance sur toute l'étendue de la zone démilitarisée de manière à empêcher qu'aucune action ne puisse être effectuée ou préparée qui, directement ou indirectement, porterait atteinte à la neutralité de la zone.

5. Les forces armées autorisées par ces forces de gendarmerie et de police et pour ces garnisons seront fixées en considération du service à assurer par le Commandement international des troupes d'occupation visées à l'article 3 ci-dessus.

6. La Grande-Bretagne, la France et l'Italie, agissant conjointement, auront la faculté d'exercer la surveillance sur toute l'étendue de la zone démilitarisée de manière à empêcher qu'aucune action ne puisse être effectuée ou préparée qui, directement ou indirectement, porterait atteinte à la neutralité de la zone.

7. 3 du présent article.

Cette surveillance sera exercée :

Au point de vue naval, par un stationnaire de chacune des dites Puissances alliées.

Au point de vue militaire, par un service d'inspection confié à des officiers alliés, et un sera organisé dans les conditions fixées par le Commandement international d'Occupation.

8. La Grande-Bretagne, la France et l'Italie, agissant conjointement, auront, en outre, la faculté de maintenir dans la presqu'île de Gallipoli telles forces militaires et aériennes qu'elles estimeront nécessaires.

Tout en limitant l'occupation internationale à la région ci-dessus visée, les dites Puissances se réservent le droit de l'étendre conjointement à d'autres régions de la zone démilitarisée prévue à l'article 179 dans le cas où les stipulations qui font l'objet du présent article viendraient à être violées.

6. Les forces d'occupation visées ci-dessus pourront, en cas de nécessité, exercer à terre le droit de réquisition, &c. . . (comme dans le dernier alinéa du texte de l'article 178 du Traité de Sévres).

7. La Grande-Bretagne, la France et l'Italie retireront leurs forces de Constantinople et la partie de la zone démilitarisée qu'elles doivent évacuer suivant la marche de l'exécution du traité.

ARTICLE 179.

La zone prévue à l'article 178 est limitée comme il suit :

1. En Europe.

Côtes de la mer Egée, de Cap Helles à l'embouchure de la Maritza—rives orientales de la Maritza jusqu'à un point situé à 20 kilom. sud d'Andrinople—arc de cercle ayant Pravodja, cours de cette rivière jusqu'à la frontière bulgare—frontière bulgare jusqu'à la mer Noire—côtes de la mer Noire jusqu'au Bosphore (rive ouest).

2. En Asie.

Bosphore (rive est) côtes de la mer Noire jusqu'au cap situé à 18 kilom. et de Sinlé—traversant cet isthme dans la partie la plus étroite, côtes de la Marmara jusqu'au point où la frontière du sandjak de Tehanlak aboutit à la Marmara, frontière du sandjak jusqu'à son débouché dans le golfe d'Adramit.

3. Iles.

Sont comprises dans la zone démi-

(a.) Les îles de la mer de Marmara.

(b.) Les îles de Samothrace, Imbros, Tenedos, Lemnos et Mytilène.

ARTICLE 180.

Une commission sera constituée dans les quinze jours qui suivront la mise en vigueur de la zone démilitarisée prévue à l'article 179. Cette commission sera composée . . . (sans changement jusqu'à la fin de l'article 180).

Le 21 mars 1912.

ANNEX 3.

Proposition des Experts militaires au sujet des Dispositions concernant la Démilitarisation de la Thrace orientale et de la Zone des Détroits.

Ces dispositions sont indiquées ci-dessous sous forme d'articles à insérer dans le traité en remplacement des articles 161, 178, 179 et 180 du Traité de Sévres.

ARTICLE 161.

Dans les territoires de la zone démilitarisée qui sont ou seront occupés par les forces ottomanes ou ottomanes seront subordonnées au Commandement international d'occupation de ces territoires.

ARTICLE 178.

En vue d'éviter les contacts armés entre les forces turques et helléniques, et de garantir d'autre part la liberté des Détroits, les hautes parties contractantes conviennent des dispositions suivantes :

1. Dans le délai de trois mois à partir de la mise en vigueur du présent traité, il sera procédé au désarmement et au démantèlement de tous ouvrages, fortifications ou batteries dans une zone comprenant les territoires et îles définies à l'article 179 ci-après.

Sont interdites dans ladite zone . . . (sans changement jusqu'à la fin du paragraphe 1 de l'article 178 du Traité de Sévres).

2. Sans changement.

3. Les territoires et les îles de la zone démilitarisée ne pourront être utilisés militairement, en cas de nécessité, que par les trois Puissances alliées ci-dessus visées agissant conjointement. Cette disposition n'est pas exclusive de l'emploi dans lesdites zones et îles des forces de gendarmerie et de police helléniques ou ottomanes nécessaires pour y maintenir l'ordre, non plus que d'une garnison hellénique que dans l'île de M . . . une garnison ottomane à Constantinople en plus de la garde personnelle du Sultan prévue à l'article 152.

Toutefois, les effectifs maximum autorisés pour ces forces de gendarmerie et de . . . le Commandement international des troupes d'occupation visées à l'alinéa 3 ci-dessus.

4. La Grande-Bretagne, la France et l'Italie, agissant conjointement, auront la faculté d'exercer la surveillance sur toute l'étendue de la zone démilitarisée, de manière à empêcher qu'aucune action puisse être effectuée préparée qui directement, ou indirectement, serait susceptible de porter atteinte aux stipulations des alinéas 1, 2 et 3 du présent article.

Cette surveillance sera exercée :

Au point de vue naval, par un stationnaire de chacune desdites Puissances alliées ;

Au point de vue militaire, par un service d'inspection confié à des officiers alliés, et qui sera organisé dans les conditions fixées par le Commandement international d'Occupation.

5. La Grande-Bretagne, la France et l'Italie, agissant conjointement, auront en . . . la mer de Marmara jusqu'à Rodosto inclus toutes les forces militaires et aériennes qu'elles estimeront nécessaires.

Tout en limitant l'occupation internationale à la région ci-dessus visée, lesdites Puissances se réservent le droit de l'étendre conjointement à d'autres régions de la zone démilitarisée prévue à l'article 179, dans le cas où les stipulations qui font l'objet du présent article viendraient à être violées.

6. Les forces d'occupation visées ci-dessus, pourront en cas de nécessité, exercer à terre le droit de réquisition, &c. . . (comme dans le dernier alinéa du texte de l'article 178 du Traité de Sévres).

7. La Grande-Bretagne, la France et l'Italie retireront leurs forces de Constantinople et la partie de la zone démilitarisée qu'elles doivent évacuer trois mois à partir de la mise en vigueur du présent traité.

ARTICLE 179.

La zone prévue à l'article 178 est limitée comme il suit :

1. En Europe.

Côtes de la mer Egée : du cap Helles à l'embouchure de la Maritza—rives orientales de la Maritza jusqu'à un point situé à 20 kilom. sud d'Andrinople—arc de cercle ayant Andrinople comme centre, avec le même rayon, jusqu'à sa rencontre avec la rivière Pravodja, cours de cette rivière jusqu'à la frontière bulgare—frontière bulgare jusqu'à la mer Noire—côtes de la mer Noire jusqu'au Bosphore (rive ouest).

2. En Asie.

—ligne allant de ce cap au cap de Yarmudje (golfe d'Issak) —côtes de la mer de Marmara au cap d'Yarmudje à l'isthme séparant du continent la presqu'île d'Actai. ligne traversant cet isthme dans la partie la plus étroite, côtes de la Marmara jusqu'au point où la frontière du sandjak de Tehanlak aboutit à la Marmara, frontière du sandjak jusqu'à son débouché dans le golfe d'Adramit.

3. Iles.

Sont comprises dans la zone démilitarisée

(a.) Les îles de la mer de Marmara.

(b.) Les îles de Samothrace, Imbros, Tenedos, Lemnos et Mytilène.

[8975]

ARTICLE 180

Une commission sera constituée dans les quinze jours qui suivront la mise en vigueur du présent traité pour fixer sur place les limites de la partie continentale de la zone démilitarisée prévue à l'article 179. Cette commission sera composée . . . (sans changement jusqu'à la fin de l'article 180).

ANNEX 4

The Allied Powers desire to secure to Turkey the greatest measure of economic freedom. For this purpose they are prepared to set up at Constantinople, within three months from the coming into force of the treaty of peace, a commission composed of representatives of technical experts representing the other capitulatory Powers, proposals for the revision of the capitulatory régime in fiscal matters.

subjects, while safeguarding the former against excessive taxation and abuses in collection, and for any necessary modification of the customs taxes with the consent of the Powers concerned.

As regards the Capitulations in judicial matters, the Allied Powers repeat their original offer to set up within the same period a similar commission to prepare a scheme of judicial reform to replace the capitulatory system, which will continue pending the representation, will be at liberty to recommend either a mixed or a united judicial system.

[E 3510/3 44]

No. 77

Minutes of the Eighth Meeting of Foreign Ministers at the Quai d'Orsay at 10 A.M., March 26, 1922. (Received at Foreign Office, April 3)

Present

For France	M. Poincaré M. de Perrotti de la Rocca M. Bargeon
For Great Britain	Marquess Curzon of Kedleston Mr. R. G. Vansittart Mr. E. G. Forbes Adam
For Italy	Signor Schanzer Marquis Visconti Venosta Signor Guariglia

Interpreter M. Camerlynck

M. Gout was present during the discussion of the Genoa Conference.

There were also present during the discussion of Annex 1 —

Marshal Foch.	General Sir C. Harrington
General Guiraud	Colonel Heywood
General Weygand	General Marie

Admiral Margerie and Commander Ranisay were present for the consideration of Annex 2.

M. Hutchinson and M. Gout were also present for the discussion of Annex 3. The military experts attended.

Conscription and Gendarmes

Marshal Foch read the recommendations of the military experts (Annex 1).

M. Poincaré pointed out that the first recommendation did not amount to the abolition of conscription.

Lord Curzon reminded the Conference that in the case of Bulgaria and of all the other ex-enemy States the Allies had enforced the complete and immediate abolition of conscription by the Treaty of Peace as a step towards general disarmament. The Allies should certainly reaffirm the principle, and not insert in the treaty the idea that the abolition of conscription might be postponed, still less any period for such postponement. Perhaps on grounds of expediency it might be necessary to make certain modifications after the entry into force of the treaty as had been done in the case of Bulgaria, but the principle itself must be insisted on in the treaty. He enquired if Marshal Foch agreed.

Marshal Foch said that he did.

M. Poincaré pointed out that they must also remember the question whether the Turks would accept what was proposed. If they did not accept what were the Allies to do? They must make every endeavour to bring the Turks into the proposed conference.

Lord Curzon replied that if the Turks refused the most reasonable terms which the Allies were offering as a whole they would offend the public opinion of the world, but the Allies should certainly not again modify their proposals in consequence. They should affirm the principle of conscription in their offer of general terms.

M. Poincaré said that his observations were of a general nature and he was in agreement as to the principle. They must remember the public opinion of Islam and the world, with special reference to Morocco and India and the position of Mesopotamia and Syria. He was pleading the cause of prudence, not that of Angora, and the Allies should not promise that they would do anything which they were not in a position to enforce.

Signor Schanzer suggested that conscription was a sensitive point for so essentially military a people as the Turks, possibly the Allies might leave the whole question vague.

M. Poincaré thought that perhaps it would be better to find a vague formula such as "Il sera étudié à la conférence prochaine la suppression du service obligatoire." They were only considering the main terms of the treaty.

conscript army. The Turks would demand it and the Allies would have to reply, the point must therefore be mentioned, and they must stand firm on the question of principle as they had done in the other Peace Treaties. M. Poincaré's formula left the question too open, it would not do to refer questions of principle to the next conference.

After further discussion the following formula was adopted in substitution for the first recommendation of the military experts:

"Quant aux forces armées de la Turquie, les Puissances ne voient pas la possibilité d'admettre le maintien de la conscription, qui a été écartée dans tous les traités signés avec les Puissances européennes. Elles sont toutefois disposées à considérer dans un esprit amical la détermination de la période dans laquelle le système de recrutement volontaire devra être admis."

Marshal Foch read the second clause of the recommendations of the military experts (see Annex 1).

Lord Curzon enquired whether under these proposals there was any definite ratio between the size of the Turkish armed forces and that of the population of the country. Such a ratio had been provided for in the case of Austria and the other enemy countries.

fifteen were raised from the territory which was to remain Turkish. He had the day before recommended to Marshal Foch the figures contained in the experts' proposals: these figures were based on the idea of fifteen divisions of 2,500 men each, the gendarmerie being based on the old numbers.

army of 30,000 men had been allowed, so the ratio in the case of Turkey was about the same as in that of Austria. In the case of Hungary the proportion was also about the same.

Lord Curzon asked how they were to stop conscription if Turkey were allowed to keep an army of this size

Marshal Foch said that they would have to do it in the same way as in the case of other countries, such as Germany—by the threat of force

Lord Curzon agreed generally, but pointed out that the case of Turkey was different to-day from that of other countries, since the Allies could not occupy portions of her territory, as they had done in the case of Germany, nor had they yet disarmed her

The second recommendation of the military experts and the figures proposed for the Turkish forces under the new treaty were then adopted

The third recommendation of the military advisers (see Annex 1) was then read.

Lord Curzon understood the opinion of his military advisers to be that in practice the Turks would be unable to raise any large or effective force of gendarmerie without the assistance of foreign officers, and that as they were rather to take the place of a local police force scattered over wide areas and were not intended to defend the frontiers, it was right that their numbers should be larger than the other elements.

General Harington said that they could stand behind the other frontier forces in case of emergency but that they had no technical auxiliary troops and were therefore not on the same basis as the other Turkish forces

Lord Curzon then referred to the principle of the division of Allied gendarmerie officers in accordance with the zones of the Tripartite Agreement and enquired whether in fact the adoption of the last paragraph of the recommendation of the military advisers would not mean that the division in accordance with the Tripartite Agreement would be abolished

M. Poincaré suggested that in any communication to be made to the Turks the question of the proportion of Allied officers in the Turkish gendarmerie should not be equal division among the Allies of any officers provided by them to the Turkish gendarmerie

Lord Curzon thanked M. Poincaré for this assurance but thought that its application must in practice mean the abolition of article 1 of the Tripartite Agreement

M. Poincaré said that if the principle of the division of officers in Turkey was concerned he was prepared to abandon it but he must insist on its maintenance as between the Allies. He was not sure if Lord Curzon meant to ask for gendarmerie posts in all the rest of Turkey outside the two zones, but if so he must make full reservations as regards a British monopoly of gendarmerie officers in Constantinople

Lord Curzon said that he had not made any such claim but he had thought it desirable in the event of the Turkish Government not accepting a peace settlement to revive the principle underlying article 1 of the Tripartite Agreement and to make Turkey aware of the fact that it would be necessary to be imposed on her in the two zones

Signor Schanzer said that he accepted the principle of not communicating the Tripartite Agreement to Turkey but must insist on its maintenance vis-à-vis the Allies and the application of article 1. Later this might be modified by Allied agreement

Lord Curzon said that he was not sure if the present report of the military advisers (see Annex 1) which would be wounding from the point of view of Turkey than the Tripartite Agreement

M. Poincaré repeated that he agreed as to the equal division of Allied officers for the Turkish gendarmerie in the ensemble of Turkey but their distribution should be as far as possible in accordance with the division by zones

Lord Curzon said that the principle of the division of officers in Turkey was adopted but it was agreed that no reference should be made in any document conveying the Allied terms to the Turks, to the antepenultimate and last paragraphs of the recommendations

Demilitarised Zones

A recommendation of the Allied naval advisers for the revision of parts of Chapter VIII of the Treaty of Sévres (maintenance of the freedom of the straits) (see Annex 2) was adopted

Capitulations

The conference proceeded to consider the proposed statement with regard to the Capitulations (see Annex 3)

M. Poincaré stated that he wished to make an observation upon a matter of great importance in the eyes of France which might be considered to be affected by the Capitulations. He was anxious that this most important question should not be settled in advance against France by the first paragraph of the draft. He enquired whether the reference to "the proper protection of the interests of their nationals" would deprive them of all rights in regard to the protection of others than their nationals

Signor Schanzer said that he also must make all reserves upon this matter. The question to which M. Poincaré referred had been settled at San Remo

M. Poincaré stated that as he understood it the question had been settled there only for Palestine.

Lord Curzon said that the agreement reached with M. Millerand at San Remo was that the Capitulations should be regarded as affecting the question of the protectorate one way or the other

M. Poincaré suggested that the phrase should be modified to read simply compatible with existing rights

Lord Curzon enquired whether the difficulty would be met by the substitution for the words "their nationals" of the words "foreign subjects"

M. Poincaré explained that Turkish subjects of the Catholic faith also came in question. He did not want the matter to be settled in advance against France

Lord Curzon said that he must reserve his point of view, and it should be made clear that the present discussion related to matters of a religious character, while M. Poincaré's point related to religious matters. It appeared to him that provided the position was rendered perfectly clear before they related to matters fiscal and judicial (fiscals et judiciaires)

Lord Curzon said that he had not the slightest desire or intention of raising in these discussions the question of the religious protectorates, upon which there was disagreement between the Governments and on which he thought the Italian Government were of the same opinion as the British

M. Poincaré replied that he was well aware, of course, that Lord Curzon had accepted Signor Schanzer's proposal, provided it were made quite clear in the *procès-verbal* that the draft before them related only to matters fiscal and judicial (*fiscals et judiciaires*).

Upon this understanding Lord Curzon's draft was accepted

Work of the Armies of Occupation.

M. Poincaré enquired whether the conference wished to consider at this stage the work of the Armies of Occupation

Lord Curzon pointed out that they wished to finish their immediate work to-day, and suggested that this question should be left over

This was agreed to

Statement of Conclusions reached

Lord Curzon informed the conference that he had during the previous night prepared a memorandum setting out in general terms the conclusions which the conference had reached and their reasons for coming to them. He had endeavoured to give a broad, general and fair-minded statement of the terms proposed, with an explanation of each, in a form suitable for publication to the world, so that they might be judged by their work as a whole. He suggested that he should add to this memorandum a note of the results of this morning's discussion, and should bring it before them in the afternoon.

It were found to be a fair statement, Lord Curzon would suggest that instead of having two documents, one for the press and the other for the Greeks and Turks, his statement, with any modification of wording that might be considered desirable, should be included in the communication to be sent to the latter, as a general declaration of the proposals which they were invited to consider. It could then be published on Tuesday or Wednesday or whenever the conference chose.

M. Poincaré thought it desirable to make an announcement to the press to-day, if possible, and suggested that they should be given what was being sent to Constantinople.

This point was left over for further discussion.

Place of Meeting with the Greeks and Turks

M. Poincaré pointed out that there remained the question of the place of meeting with the Greeks and Turks.

Lord Curzon suggested that this should be Constantinople. He did so for several reasons. Constantinople was the only place where the two Turkish Governments could meet together with ease, and it was close at hand for them. The High Commissioners, who had become familiar with the problem to be dealt with, were also available there. The only alternatives were London, Paris or Rome, none of which was so convenient for the purpose as Constantinople, and it had to be borne in mind that if the Turks and Greeks should come to one of those capitals and should then refuse the terms, a much more awkward position would be created for the Allies than if the meeting were held in Constantinople.

M. Poincaré feared that the choice of this city might suggest a preference to one Turkish Government over the other and might divide the Turks, and he suggested that they need not indicate at present what place within the Turkish Empire would be chosen.

It was agreed that the communication should say that the place of meeting would be fixed later.

The conference rose till 4 o'clock in the afternoon, when Lord Curzon's statement of the results of their work would be considered.

ANNEX 1

Actes des Experts militaires

Première Question.—Au bout de combien de temps la suppression du service obligatoire peut-elle être imposée à la Turquie?

Étant données les difficultés actuelles du Gouvernement turc pour assurer le paiement de la solde des troupes et de la gendarmerie, comme aussi les frais élevés qu'entraînera le recrutement par engagement volontaire, il ne paraît pas possible qu'un engagement volontaire puisse efficacement être imposé à la Turquie.

C'est seulement lorsque sa situation financière le lui permettra que la Turquie pourra recruter son armée et sa gendarmerie par engagement volontaire.

Deuxième Question.—Quels effectifs est-il possible d'accorder à la Turquie pour son armée et sa gendarmerie?

Le Traité de Sévres a fixé les chiffres de

35,000 hommes pour la gendarmerie.
15,000 hommes pour l'armée

50,000 hommes au total

A Londres, en mars 1921 on a estimé possible de porter ces chiffres à

45,000 hommes pour la gendarmerie
30,000 hommes pour l'armée

75,000 hommes au total

Après un nouvel examen, les chiffres suivants semblent pouvoir être atteints

45,000 hommes pour la gendarmerie.
30,000 à 40,000 hommes pour l'armée

75,000 à 85,000 hommes au total

Le nombre de troupes de campagne, à l'exclusion d'artillerie lourde

celle qui était prévue dans le Traité de Sévres, elle pourra comprendre 4,000 hommes pour une armée de 30,000 hommes. La cavalerie devra également entrer pour une très large proportion dans la composition de la gendarmerie.

Troisième Question.—Est-il indispensable de placer dans la gendarmerie turque des officiers alliés pour y participer à l'organisation, au commandement et à l'instruction?

L'expérience a montré qu'il serait très désirable, au point de vue des résultats militaires, à obtenir que des officiers alliés soient placés dans les formations de gendarmerie.

Mais on reconnaît qu'il est impossible de l'imposer aux Turcs.

Il semble, en conséquence, que le seul moyen pratique serait pour les Puissances alliées de recommander à la Turquie l'utilisation d'officiers alliés pour l'organisation, le commandement et l'instruction de la gendarmerie, en indiquant que ces officiers seraient au service de la Turquie, selon les pratiques en usage avant 1914.

Il y aurait lieu, en outre, de spécifier que les officiers ainsi employés devraient appartenir en proportion égale aux trois Puissances alliées.

ANNEX 2

Propositions des experts navales au sujet des dispositions concernant la Démilitarisation de la Zone des Détroits

1. A l'article VIII des Conditions de Paix, sous le titre "Matière de la Démilitarisation," ajouter en sous-titre: "Dispositions militaires et navales."

2. Ajouter à la fin de l'article 178, présenté par les experts militaires, les additions ci-après:

Alinéa 1.—Après les mots: "Il sera procédé au désarmement et au démantèlement des ouvrages, fortifications, batteries, arsenaux, etc., situés dans la zone ou pendant les territoires et les îles définies à l'article 179 ci-après," ajouter: "Il sera procédé également à la destruction des ouvrages et des fortifications de tous genres (ouvrages de défense, postes de tir, etc., etc.) existant sur le littoral ou dans les eaux de la même zone."

(a) Alinéa suivant: "Sont interdits..." remplacer les mots: "La reconstruction de ces ouvrages," par les mots: "La reconstruction de ces ouvrages terrestres et maritimes."

(b) Alinéa 3.—Remplacer les mots: "Les territoires et les îles de la zone démilitarisée," par: "Les territoires ainsi que les eaux, ports et rades de la zone démilitarisée et des îles qu'elle comprend."

ANNEX 3

The Allied Powers desire to secure Turkey the greatest measure of economic independence compatible with the maintenance of the interests of their nationals. For this purpose they are prepared to set up a Commission within Turkey to study the country and to make a survey of its resources. This Commission composed of representatives of Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan, and of Turkey,

As regards the capitulations in judicial matters, the Allied Powers repeat their original offer to set up within the same period a similar commission to prepare a scheme of judicial reform to replace the capitulatory system, which will continue provisionally pending the introduction of the proposed scheme. This commission, on which Turkey will be represented, will be at liberty to recommend either a mixed or an unified judicial system.

E 3511 5 44

*Minutes of the Ninth Meeting of Foreign Ministers at the Quai d'Orsay
at 4 P.M. March 26 1922 (Received at Foreign Office April 3)*

Present

For France	M. Poincaré M. de Peretti de la Rocca M. Burgeon M. Gout
For Great Britain	Marquess Curzon of Kedleston Mr. R. G. Vansittart Mr. E. G. Forbes Adam
For Italy	Signor Schanzer Marquis Visconti Venosta Signor Guariglia

Interpreter, M. Amerlynck

Text of Communication to the Greeks and Turks

M. Poincaré began by thanking Lord Curzon for the draft communication to the Greek and Turkish Governments, which he had prepared and circulated to the conference before the meeting (see Annex I). As a whole it corresponded entirely with the French views.

Signor Schanzer said that he also wished to congratulate Lord Curzon on a draft which admirably reflected the general Allied point of view.

M. Amerlynck then read the draft.

M. Poincaré then said that the draft had been examined under all its aspects "for" discussed, "and" following proposals "for" conclusions, "on p. 1

These were agreed to.

M. Poincaré said he would like to say something in the preamble as to the terms being subject to the views of the respective Parliaments.

Lord Curzon pointed out that this communication was only the preliminary stage towards the final conclusion of a new Peace Treaty, which would presumably have in any case to be confirmed by the various Parliaments.

Signor Schanzer agreed.

M. Poincaré then said that he would like to say something in the preamble as to the terms being subject to the views of the respective Parliaments.

After some discussion it was agreed that M. Poincaré should whether some reference should not be made to the phrase "entire independence" of Turkey which appeared in the National Pact.

Lord Curzon pointed out that this was hardly possible, even if desirable, owing to the servitudes imposed with regard to the Straits.

M. Poincaré proposed to stop at the word "development," and omit the word "national" in paragraph 4. He was afraid Greek ambitions might be roused by such a phrase.

Lord Curzon said that he must insist on the retention of the word "national." This paragraph was intended to emphasise the Allied intention to deal fairly by the Greek nation. The Turks were not the only people who were to be allowed to have national aspirations. He would, however, accept some such phrase as "national and economic progress."

This was agreed to.

It was also agreed to omit the words "without humiliation," on p. 4.

Lord Curzon explained that in the third paragraph on p. 4 he wished to say that the Allied Powers would respect the independence and integrity of Asia Minor in unimpaired sovereignty.

M. Poincaré suggested that it was unwise to imply that the Allies were unable to turn Greece out of Thrace, on p. 7.

Lord Curzon pointed out that Marshal Foch had agreed with him in the draft to say that the Allied Powers would respect the independence and integrity of Asia Minor in unimpaired sovereignty. He suggested the change accordingly, i.e., instead of "in these circumstances" at the beginning of the paragraph on p. 7.

Some discussion followed as to the description of the frontier of Eastern Thrace to be inserted in the draft.

M. Poincaré objected to the precise description given to the proposed line, and the mention of Ganos as the starting point on the coast, and Tsmikigori as the point of termination on the Bulgarian frontier. He said that he had only agreed on the previous day to the line originally proposed by the military advisers (i.e., that running from Hora on the coast through the towns of Silba Eski and Kirk Kilisse being deflected north of the railway).

Lord Curzon said that he understood from his military advisers that after the principle of pushing the frontier to the eastward of the line originally recommended by the military advisers, the line had been accepted by the conference on the previous day, the military experts had drawn a new line on the map, which, south of the railway, followed the crest north of Ganos instead of the plain north of Hora. Marshal Foch had admitted to him that this was a better strategic frontier, and he was quite prepared to accept the Marshal's ruling on the subject.

M. Poincaré regretted that this was the first time he had seen the new tract, and he would require to study it further with his military advisers.

Lord Curzon said that he would not at the moment suggest any modification, though he had no doubt as to the line which had been proposed and accepted, but he was willing to describe the point of departure from the coast as a point "in the neighbourhood of Ganos," and the point where the Bulgarian frontier was reached "as the western part of the Stranja mountains."

This was accepted.

On p. 10 of the draft it was agreed to omit a reference to "the three months from the entry into force of the treaty," and to say "will be altogether withdrawn after the ratification of the Treaty of Peace." In the last paragraph on p. 10 Lord Curzon proposed to say "the Allied Powers will maintain a force including Turkish gendarmerie, instead of saying "75,000" to "85,000" men as proposed in the second recommendation of the military advisers.

It was agreed to take 85,000 as the total.

Lord Curzon proposed that a paragraph should be inserted giving the main lines of the financial decisions.

After a discussion in which Signor Schanzer asked that some formula should be accepted to cover his proposal, which had already been agreed to, as to consultation between the Liquidation Commission and the Turkish Ministries dealing with concessions, a paragraph drafted by Lord Curzon was inserted and accepted.

The demilitarised zone on the Asiatic shore of the Straits will extend from on the Mediterranean to on the Marmora. No further demilitarisation is proposed on the southern shores of the Marmora. On the Asiatic coast of the Bosphorus the demilitarised zone will extend inland to a line drawn from to The islands of outside the Dardanelles, and of in the Marmora will equally be demilitarised.

Passing to the European shore of the Dardanelles and the Marmora, the Powers have been confronted with the difficult and anxious problem of the future of Eastern Thrace. On the one hand, they were unable, for the reasons which have already been stated, to accept a solution that would place the Gallipoli Peninsula once more in the hands of Turkey. On the other hand, they were met by the complaint that some at any rate of the lines of frontier that have hitherto been proposed between the European possessions of Turkey, to the north and west of Constantinople, and the areas in Eastern Thrace in the occupation of the Greeks afforded insufficient protection against the military menace of invasion or to the invidious proximity of a neighbour with whom it had recently been at war.

Such dangers it was obvious would be most effectively removed by the removal to a sufficient distance from Constantinople of the present frontier, and by the effective demilitarisation of the areas outside this line.

It is the incontestable fact of the existing situation that the Powers have held to constitute a valid title, the Greek forces are in effective

possession, moreover, contains, and has long contained, a considerable, and in parts a preponderant, Greek population. In these circumstances, the Powers could not assume the responsibility of requiring from Greece not merely the complete evacuation of Anatolia to which it must be remembered in passing that Greece was invited in 1919 by the Powers, but the complete evacuation of Eastern Thrace in addition. Such a demand would have been consistent neither with equity nor with practicability. It would have been unjust, and it could not be enforced.

In these circumstances, and bearing in mind the importance of the strategical considerations before referred to, which may be summed up in the desideratum of reasonable security for the capital and the state of Turkey in Europe, the Foreign Ministers of the Powers invited the military authorities under Marshal Foch to assist them with their expert advice. These authorities recommended the drawing of a line which will run from the neighbourhood of Ganos on the Marmora in a northerly and north easterly direction to a point on the Bulgarian frontier at

This frontier will leave Rodosto, a Greek town, to the Turks. It will

The safety of the frontier is assured by the topographical features of the country, and will be further confirmed by the demilitarisation of the entire area of Eastern Thrace both on the Greek and the Turkish sides of the frontier. Thus the Greeks will not be able to threaten Constantinople, and the Turks will not be in a position to attack the Greeks.

The periodical inspection of these and the other demilitarised zones will be the area of whose occupation will be extended eastwards to Rodosto.

It has been considered whether any special provision should be made for the town of Adrianople, which it has been found impossible to sever from the surrounding territories of Eastern Thrace. Smyrna, which will revert to Turkey, and Adrianople, which will be retained by the Greeks, are in a somewhat analogous position. The Powers will be quite willing to enter into friendly communication with the Turkish and Greek Governments, with a view to the conclusion of a friendly agreement upon conditions which will guarantee a full and fair share to the non-Turkish and the non-Greek elements in the populations in the administration of the two cities and will further safeguard the religious buildings and institutions of Adrianople.

The Powers are not so vain as to suppose that this solution of the Thracian problem will be warmly accepted by either party. The problem admits of no such easy solution. They can only commend it to the public opinion of the world as the proposition which seems to them to be most consistent alike with justice and with the facts of the case.

Passing to Constantinople, the Powers desire to confirm their previously expressed intention of the Treaty of Sèvres to revoke at some future date the retrocession of the capital to the Turks. They confirm the restoration of that city to the full authority of the Government of the Sultan, and they are further willing to engage that the Allied forces, by whom it is at present occupied, shall be altogether withdrawn with the least possible delay after the ratification of the future Treaty of Peace.

The Turkish Government will be invited to garrison the city with a larger force than was contemplated in the Treaty of Sèvres.

There remain the questions of the future armed forces of the Turkish State, the financial independence which it will enjoy, and the suggested modification or surrender of the capitulatory rights which are enjoyed by foreigners.

Concerning the armed forces of Turkey, the Allied Powers are unable to depart from the principles which it has been found necessary to enforce in the treaties of the past. They will, however, be prepared to consider with the Turkish Government in an amicable spirit the determination of the period within which the voluntary system of recruiting must be established in that country.

As regards the financial independence of the Turkish State, the Allied Powers will be ready to consider with the Turkish Government the suggestion that the Turkish Government should be invited to take over the management of the Turkish railways, and to assume the responsibility of the Turkish public debt.

As regards the capitulatory rights, the Allied Powers will be ready to consider with the Turkish Government the suggestion that the Turkish Government should be invited to take over the management of the Turkish railways, and to assume the responsibility of the Turkish public debt.

to Turkey the largest measure of economic independence consistent with the due protection of the interests of their nationals. For this purpose they are prepared to set up at Constantinople, within three months from the coming into force of the Treaty of Peace, a Commission composed of representatives of Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan, and of Turkey, to prepare with the assistance of technical experts representing the other Capitulatory Powers, proposals for the revision of the capitulatory régime in fiscal matters.

These proposals shall provide for fiscal equality between foreign and Turkish subjects, while safeguarding the former against excessive taxation and abuses in collection, and for any necessary modification of the customs taxes with the consent of the Powers concerned.

Such, in broad outline, are the main features of the settlement which the Ministers of the three Great Powers, acting on behalf of their Governments, have agreed to propose to the Turkish Government. It is not necessary to add that the people or the Government by whom they were rejected, if such a misfortune were to occur, would assume a very grave responsibility before the public opinion of mankind, namely the responsibility of resuming a struggle which has already wrought sufficient havoc among the peoples of two continents, and the renewal of which can only bring further ruin and destruction in its train, besides leading to a permanent enmity between the races and creeds of the Near East.

March 27, 1922

ANNEX 2 TO MINUTE 9

The Foreign Ministers of the Allied Powers of France, Great Britain and Italy, having during five days in succession discussed every aspect of the situation in the Near East, having consulted at each stage the military and financial experts who were summoned for the purpose, and having further enjoyed the advantage of the views of the Turkish Government, they put forward as the most equitable solution that it is in their power to offer to the Near Eastern problem.

The principles which they have throughout borne in mind and which are the basis of their proposals have been —

1. They desire to re-establish peace between the conflicting armies of Turkey and Greece, but to deal fairly with both parties and to impose upon neither conditions of discomfiture or defeat.
2. They desire to re-establish the Turkish nation and the Turkish dominion in the areas which may fairly be regarded as their own, with the historic and renowned capital of Constantinople as the centre, and with such powers as may enable them to renew a vigorous and independent national existence.
3. They desire to secure full and fair treatment to the followers of the creed of Islam and to maintain the secular and religious authority of the Sultan of Turkey.
4. They desire to compensate the Greek nation for the great sacrifices which they have accepted during the war in the cause of the Allies, and to leave them free scope for their national and economic progress in the future.
5. They desire to enable both peoples in regions where they are contiguous or where their populations are intermingled to live in future in conditions of mutual confidence and self respect.
6. They desire to provide for the protection and security of the various minorities whether Moslem or Christian or of other races and creeds, who, whether in Europe or Asia find themselves placed in the midst of larger political or ethnic aggregations.
7. They desire to prevent the recurrence of armed conflict between the Turkish nation and the European Powers with whom it was recently at war.
8. They desire, above all, in the solution which they propose not to be suspected of partiality for the one side or the other, but with firm hands to hold the scales even between the two.

With these ends in view the first object of the Allied Powers has been to bring about a suspension of hostilities between the confronting armies in Asia Minor in order to enable them to withdraw to positions which would be in accordance with the principles of justice and equity which both parties and which were defined by the military authorities under the presidency of Marshal Foch.

The Hellenic Government has already signified its acceptance of this proposal. The Turkish Government has also signified its acceptance of the proposal. The evacuation of Turkish sovereignty over the whole of that region. The arrangements for this evacuation, as the first step in the general settlement which is now proposed, have been agreed upon and are capable of being put into execution without delay. It is calculated that the period required for a complete and peaceful withdrawal of the Greek forces will be somewhat over four months.

It will be observed that in the event of these proposals being accepted by both parties, the evacuation of the Turkish forces will be effected in a manner which will be in accordance with the principles of justice and equity which both parties and which were defined by the military authorities under the presidency of Marshal Foch.

Should this operation be successfully accomplished, the Turkish sovereignty in Asia Minor will be re-established from the borders of Transcaucasia, Persia and Mesopotamia to the shores of the Aegean.

These provisions will be based both upon the stipulations contained in existing treaties or drafts of treaties and upon the principles of justice and equity which both parties and which were defined by the military authorities under the presidency of Marshal Foch. Furthermore, the Powers have decided to invite the League of Nations to collaborate in this object by the appointment of special Commissioners to

superintend the execution of these provisions in the areas and for the communities who are principally concerned.

The case of the Armenians has called for special consideration by reason both of the undertakings entered into by the Allied Powers in the course of the war and of the cruel sufferings of that people. Accordingly the aid of the League of Nations is sought over and above the protection accorded by the minority provisions to which reference has already been made in order to obtain for the Armenians the satisfaction of their traditional aspirations for a national home.

The interests of peace and the safety of the future demand that Europe shall never again be exposed to the perils and sacrifices which were imposed upon her in 1914 and the succeeding years by the forcible closure of the Dardanelles. The countless lives that were there poured out, the stupendous efforts that were entailed, must not have been expended in vain. The Turks will be readmitted to the Asiatic shore of the Dardanelles under conditions which will provide for the existence of a broad demilitarised zone in order to obviate the possibility of any hostile military preparations in that quarter. But an Allied force must be placed, and must remain, in occupation of the Gallipoli Peninsula in order to safeguard the free and unimpeded entrance of the Straits. This also will be a demilitarised zone. The Allied garrison will consist of a force sufficient to secure the entrance to the Dardanelles.

The navigation of the Straits will be placed as already proposed under the control of an International Commission under a Turkish President, on which it is hoped, at a time passes, that all the principal States who are interested in the commerce or navigation of the Straits will be represented.

The demilitarised zone on the Asiatic shore of the Straits will be identical with the existing Sanjak of Chank. No further demilitarisation is proposed on the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus. On the Asiatic shores of the Bosphorus the demilitarised zone will be identical with the existing neutral zone. The islands of Lemnos, Imbros, Tenedos, Samothrace and Mytilene outside the Dardanelles and all the islands in the Marmora will equally be demilitarised.

Passing to the European shore of the Dardanelles and the Marmora, the three Ministers have been confronted with the difficult and anxious problem of the future of Eastern Thrace. On the one hand, they were unable, for the reasons which have already been stated to accept a solution which would place the Gallipoli Peninsula once more in the hands of Turkey. On the other hand they were met by the complaint that some at any rate of the lines of frontier that have hitherto been proposed between the European possessions of Turkey to the north and west of Constantinople and the areas in Eastern Thrace in the occupation of the Greeks offer insufficient protection to the Turkish capital which might find itself exposed in the future either to the military menace of invasion or to the invidious proximity of a neighbour with whom it had recently been at war.

Such dangers, it was obvious, would be most effectively removed (a) by the removal to a sufficient distance from Constantinople of the projected frontier, (b) by the effective neutralisation of the areas outside this line. Furthermore, the Ministers were confronted by the incontestable facts of the existing situation. Whether the attribution of Eastern Thrace to the Greeks by the unratified Treaty of Sèvres be or be not held to constitute a valid title, the Greek forces are in effective occupation, and the Greek Government is engaged in administering that area, which, moreover, contains, and has long contained, a considerable and in certain parts, a preponderant Greek population.

In these circumstances the Ministers were unable to assume the responsibility of requiring from Greece not merely the complete evacuation of Anatolia, to which it was already bound, but also the complete evacuation of Eastern Thrace in addition.

Accordingly, bearing in mind the importance of the strategical consideration before referred to, which may be summed up in the desideratum of reasonable security for the capital and the State of Turkey in Europe, the Foreign Ministers of the Allied Powers have decided to propose the following solution.

These authorities recommended the drawing of a line which will run from the neighbourhood of Ganos on the Marmora in a northerly and north-easterly direction to a point on the Bulgarian frontier in the western part of the Istranja Mountains. This frontier will leave Rodosto, a Greek town, to the Turks. It will keep Baba Esik and Kirk Kilise on the Greek side of the Turco-Greek frontier. The safety of the frontier is assured by the topographical features of the country, and will be further

confirmed by the demilitarisation of almost the entire area of Eastern Thrace both on the Greek and on the Turkish sides of the frontier. Thus the Greeks will not be able to threaten Constantinople, and the Turks will not be in a position to attack the Greeks.

The periodical inspection of these and the other demilitarised zones will be undertaken by Allied forces on the Gallipoli Peninsula, the area of whose occupation will be extended eastwards to Rodosto.

It has been considered whether any special provision should be made for the town of Adrianople, which it has been found impossible to sever from the surrounding territories of Eastern Thrace. Smyrna, which will revert to Turkey, and Adrianople, which will be retained by the Greeks, are in a somewhat analogous position. The three Governments, with a view to the conclusion of a friendly agreement upon conditions which will guarantee a fair and full share to the non-Turkish and the non-Greek elements in the populations in the administration of the two cities, and will further safeguard the religious buildings and institutions of Adrianople.

The three Ministers are not so vain as to suppose that this solution of the Thracian problem will be warmly accepted by either party. The problem admits of no such easy solution. They can only recommend it to the public opinion of the world as the proposition which seems to them to be most consistent alike with justice and with the facts of the case.

Passing to Constantinople, the three Governments desire to confirm their previously expressed willingness to withdraw altogether the threat that was made at the time of the Treaty of Sévres to revoke at some future date the retrocession of the capital to the Turks. They confirm the restoration of that city to the full authority of the Government of the Sultan, and they are further willing to engage that the ratification of the future Treaty of Peace.

The Turkish Government will be invited to garrison the city with a larger force than was contemplated in the Treaty of Sévres. There remain questions of the future armed forces of the Turkish State, the financial independence which it will enjoy, and the suggested modification or surrender of the capitulatory rights which are enjoyed by foreigners.

Concerning the armed forces of Turkey, the Allied Powers are unable to depart from the principles which it has been found necessary to enforce in the treaties that have been concluded with all the other States recently at war, or to admit the continuance of the system of conscription. They will, however, be prepared to consider with the Turkish Government in an amiable spirit the determination of the period in which the voluntary system of recruiting must be established in that country.

As to the numerical strength of the Turkish forces, it is proposed to allow a very appreciable augmentation of the figures which were contained in the Treaty of Sévres or were afterwards suggested in London in 1921. The forces now finally proposed are gendarmerie 45,000, regular army 40,000, or a grand total of 85,000 men—a total which is very markedly in excess of the 50,000 designated in the Treaty of Sévres.

Should the Turkish Government desire the assistance of foreign officers for the organisation of the above-named force of gendarmerie—a measure which will probably be found to conduce greatly to its efficiency—the Powers will be ready to place them at the disposal of the Turkish Government.

With regard to the financial independence of the Turkish State, the three Governments are ready to consider any proposal which may be made by the Turkish Government, provided it is modified in such a way as to be consistent with the principles of justice and equity.

The three Governments are further prepared to consider any proposal which may be made by the Turkish Government, provided it is modified in such a way as to be consistent with the principles of justice and equity.

In the event of the conclusion of a friendly agreement upon conditions which will guarantee a fair and full share to the non-Turkish and the non-Greek elements in the populations in the administration of the two cities, and will further safeguard the religious buildings and institutions of Adrianople.

representatives of Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan, and of Turkey, to prepare with the assistance of technical experts representing the other capitulatory Powers proposals for the revision of the capitulatory régime in fiscal matters.

The three Governments are further prepared to consider any proposal which may be made by the Turkish Government, provided it is modified in such a way as to be consistent with the principles of justice and equity.

As regards the Capitulations in judicial matters, the Allied Powers repeat their former offer to set up within the same period a similar commission to prepare a scheme of judicial reform to replace the capitulatory system, which will continue to be in force until the new system is established. The commission, on which Turkey will be represented, will be at liberty to recommend either a mixed or a unified judicial system.

Such, in broad outlines, are the main features of the settlement which the Ministers of the three Great Powers, acting on behalf of their Governments, have decided unanimously to recommend. These proposals are now submitted primarily to the judgment of the two parties who are directly involved, but secondarily, and in a not inferior degree, to that of the civilised world.

Nor is it necessary to add that the people or the Government by whom they were deliberately rejected, if such a misfortune were to occur, would assume very grave responsibility before the public opinion of mankind, namely, the responsibility of resuming a struggle which has already wrought sufficient havoc among the peoples of two continents, and the renewal of which can only bring further ruin and destruction in its train, besides leading to a permanent embitterment between the races and creeds of the Near East.

E 3512 5 447

No 70

Minutes of the Tenth Meeting of Foreign Ministers at the Quai d'Orsay at 9 45 p.m., March 26, 1922. (Received at Foreign Office, April 3.)

Present

For France	M. Poincaré M. de Peretti de la Rocca M. Bargeton M. Gout
For Great Britain	Marquess Curzon of Kedleston Mr. R. G. Vansittart Mr. E. G. Forbes Adam Mr. H. W. Malkin
For Italy	Signor Schanzer Marquis Visconti-Venosta Signor Guariglia

Interpreter, M. Camerlynck

Press Communiqué

Lord Curzon stated that it was doubtful whether it would be possible to send the text of the long communications to the Greeks and Turks to the English press in time for the morning papers the next day. He would prefer that it should not be given to the press until the next day.

M. Poincaré agreed, but suggested that a short resume should be prepared at once by M. Gout for communication to the press that night.

This was accepted.

Annex to the Communications to Greek and Turkish Governments.

M. Poincaré asked if they should now discuss the summary of the conference's resolutions prepared by the French Foreign Office (see Annex 1).

Lord Curzon suggested that it might be sufficient to send the communication which he had drafted without the summary. The latter, as drafted, appeared to cover

much of the ground which was already covered by the former, and the conference would not have time to examine the text fully, since the Italian delegation had to leave almost at once. For the rest, the summary seemed to contain some points, e. g. regarding the detailed plans for the evacuation of Asm Minor, to which no reference should at present be made in any communication to the Turks.

It was agreed that the summary prepared by the French delegation should not be attached to the communication to the Turks and the Greeks, but that the various resolutions accepted by the conference and embodied in it should serve as instructions to the Allied representatives at the forthcoming conference, and might be communicated to the two Powers before the proposed meeting took place.

Covering Letter

of the letter (see Annex I) covering the communication to the Greeks, and approved and agreed by the three Foreign Ministers.

Future Allied Action.

Lord Curzon raised the question of what action the Allies should take in the unfortunate event of the Kemalists refusing to come to the conference, or demanding further details or a delay before the conference met. He did not think either reason or difficulties were likely from the side of the Greeks.

If Poincaré thought that the essential thing was to the proposed conference, and that we should use all means in our power to do this, but without the application of force,

Signor Schanzer agreed.

Lord Curzon pointed out that if the Kemalists refused an armistice, there was always the possibility of Greece evacuating Asia Minor through Brusa and Mudiana and occupying Thrace in strength. The danger of the Allies evacuating Constantinople

M. Poincaré thought that if the Turks refused the armistice it would be because they expected to cut the Greek forces in two and prevent the disembarkation of either section. He doubted whether Madama was a port where any large body of troops could be disembarked, but he would leave the matter, which was essentially a military one, considered by Marshal Foch's committee.

At Lord Curzon's request, Colonel Heywood, who had local knowledge of the situation on the Greek front, then explained that it would always be possible for the Greeks, with their present forces, to counter-attack via Koma, and thus enable the northern forces to retire via Mudania and Brusa. These forces had for the moment been brought over and reinforced from Elazeg via Muradi and Iktos to through Mudania, whence, according to a French staff officer's report, six companies of men could be embarked a day. The Turks were believed to be short of transport and had only the Koma section of railway line in South Asia Minor.

Lord Curzon suggested that in any case if this were the situation, the Allies should do what they could to hint to the Turks the consequences which were likely to follow their refusal of an armistice.

At Poincaré said that he would consider using what influence he had with Naby and Ferial Bey in Paris to bear on this point.

Prada L'omologues

Mr. Gout then read the summary of Lord Curzon's communication which he had prepared for the press, and this was agreed to.

As the Italian delegation were forced to leave at this point, the meeting broke up.

ANSWER 1.

Draft résumé of Resolutions of the Conference prepared by French Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

Les Ministres des Affaires étrangères de France, de Grande-Bretagne et d'Italie, réunis à Paris en vue de rétablir la paix dans le Proche-Orient, sont tombés d'accord

sur les conditions d'un règlement général auquel serait subordonnée l'exécution partielle de l'Asie Mineure envisagée dans la proposition d'arrangement qu'ils ont télégraphiquement le 22 de ce mois aux Gouvernements intéressés.

Pour que l'évacuation de l'Asie Mineure par les troupes helléniques et sa réoccupation par l'armée turque puissent avoir lieu sans effusion de sang et sans dévastations, il est nécessaire que les armées helléniques et turques soient réciproquement garanties contre toute reprise des hostilités même partielle au cours de leurs mouvements, que les populations et leurs biens soient garantis contre toutes exactions ou représailles de la part de l'une ou de l'autre des armées; que les opérations soient préparées et réglées suivant un programme général établi à l'avance et dans tous ses détails, qu'un organe interalleli soit chargé d'établir ce programme de concert avec les Hauts Commandements hellénique et turc, puis d'en diriger et d'assurer l'exécution, et qu'ils soient investis à cet effet des pouvoirs nécessaires pour les incidents qui pourraient se produire à cette occasion.

des forces heléniques.

des forces bellemques.

Pour diriger l'exécution de ce programme et en assurer le contrôle, l'organe interallié devra disposer des moyens suivants : (1) auprès de chacune des deux armées, d'une mission alliée comprenant des officiers de contrôle, des hommes de troupe et des moyens de transport et de liaison (automobiles, télégraphes sans fil), (2) dans la zone à évacuer, d'une mission alliée destinée, pendant la période envisagée, à participer à la réorganisation et à contrôler l'emploi des forces de sécurité locales, gendarmerie et police, (3) dans les ports d'embarquement, de forces interalliées destinées à assurer la maintenance de l'ordre et à la police des communications.

contribuer à la police des opérations à chaque

Les Gouvernements intermédiaires

George A. Smyth, of

Les Alliés ne sauraient en aucun cas accepter la responsabilité du maintien de la paix en Grèce. Ils ne sauraient accepter que la Grèce soit soumise à une administration étrangère, dans chaque zone, ce soin incombera aux autorités grecques jusqu'à évacuation, et aux autorités ottomanes dès le départ des troupes helléniques.

Les trois grandes Puissances considèrent qu'elles ont le devoir d'assurer des garanties après la paix pour la protection des minorités chrétiennes dans les possessions turques en Asie, et immortelles musulmanes en Europe. A cet effet, une étude spéciale sera faite, par une commission internationale, nommée par les trois Ministres des Affaires étrangères, des dispositions qui sont contenues dans la législation turque et dans les différents traités conclus depuis l'armistice. Ces dispositions, après avoir été examinées, seront applicables, mutatis mutandis, à toutes les minorités intéressées. La Société des Nations, dans laquelle il est présumé qu'après la conclusion de la paix la Turquie sera admise dans les mêmes conditions que la Grèce, sera invitée à assumer spécialement la responsabilité, d'une part,

à désigner, après consultation des deux Gouvernements

1 nouveau traité relatives aux minorités, aussi bien en Europe qu'en Asie. L'attention de la Société des Nations sera spécialement attirée sur la nécessité de tels commissaires dans les zones suivantes. (1) d'Asie, à Smyrne, dans le Pont, dans les vilayets de l'est et du sud-est, en Cilicie et (2) d'Europe, en Thrace et en Thessalie. Ces commissaires auront pour mission, sous le contrôle général du Haut-Commissaire du Conseil de la Société des Nations à Constantinople, de faire des visites périodiques, dans les zones en question, et de concert avec les autorités

locales, de prendre les mesures nécessaires pour protéger les minorités conformément à la Convention de La Haye de 1908 et les soumettront à la réunion annuelle de l'Assemblée de la Société, pour permettre aux nations représentées à l'Assemblée d'être en mesure d'assurer la fidèle exécution des stipulations pour lesquelles la Société aura accordé sa garantie.

Les trois Puissances, conscientes des engagements qu'elles ont publiquement pris, en tant d'occasions, d'assurer au peuple arménien une existence nationale autonome, et desirant de mettre en harmonie l'exécution de ces engagements avec la situation internationale, ont décidé d'inviter la Société des Nations à assumer la responsabilité de la mise en œuvre des garanties qui sont recommandées par la Commission des Puissances en Europe qu'en Asie, étant prévu que la Société des Nations sera membre de cette Société.

Il est estimé qu'il ne pourra se présenter d'occasion plus favorable de donner satisfaction aux demandes des Arméniens, qui, aussi bien en nombre qu'en importance, sont au premier rang de ces minorités. Les demandes des Arméniens se résument dans l'aspiration générale de se voir réserver un foyer national dans l'une ou l'autre des zones de l'Asie Mineure où ils ont jusqu'ici réalisé un nombre considérable. Le choix de la région où ce foyer pourra le mieux être assuré dépend de conditions politiques, économiques et sociales sur lesquelles il est actuellement impossible de se prononcer définitivement. Toutefois, les Puissances recommanderont particulièrement à la Société des Nations d'entreprendre, aussitôt après la conclusion de la paix, en rapport avec le Gouvernement ottoman, à l'effet de créer un tel foyer national pour les Arméniens, et de s'efforcer de déterminer les conditions auxquelles il peut être réalisé et pourvu des garanties nécessaires à son existence future. A cet effet, les Puissances promettent de donner toute l'assistance possible, convaincues que la solution du problème arménien est également désirable dans l'intérêt des Arméniens, de la Turquie et de la paix de l'Orient.

Il n'est pas sans l'intention des trois Puissances de prévoir dans le Traité de Paix un contrôle général des finances et de l'administration ottomane. Le décret de Mobarrat, les décrets annexes, ainsi que tous les contrats énumérés à l'Annexe I du projet de Traité de Sévres sont maintenus.

Il est cependant, compte des dispositions des Traités de Versailles et de Saint Germain supprimant les fonctions des délégués allemand et austro-hongrois au conseil de la Dette publique ottomane.

Le principe de la contribution à la dette publique ottomane des territoires détachés de l'Empire ottoman est maintenu, ainsi que le mode de calcul de cette contribution.

Une commission de liquidation composée de représentants des trois Puissances alliées sera chargée du règlement des dépenses d'occupation militaire des Puissances alliées depuis l'armistice jusqu'à la mise en vigueur du Traité de Paix et après cette mise en vigueur ainsi que des réclamations des ressortissants alliés pour dommages subis antérieurement à cette mise en vigueur.

La Turquie s'engage à verser à cette Commission de Liquidation, pendant vingt années, une annuité de SIXTANTE millions de francs or ou de cent millions de francs or. Toutefois, pendant les premières années, la commission aura la faculté de ne réclamer à la Turquie qu'une somme de 3,000,000 francs or ou de cent millions de francs or par an, étant entendu que la différence entre le montant total de l'annuité et cette annuité réduite sera répartie sur les années suivantes.

Pour assurer le paiement de cette annuité, le Gouvernement ottoman devra affecter irrévocablement les excédents restant libres des revenus de la douane, de la mine et de l'agriculture ainsi que la part du Gouvernement dans les concessions existantes ou à venir.

La Commission de Liquidation déterminera les moyens qu'elle jugera convenables pour assurer la gestion des revenus données en gage.

La frontière en Europe entre la Grèce et la Turquie suivra le tracé suivant : elle partira d'un point à choisir à l'ouest de Ganos sur la mer de Marmara pour aboutir à

Suba-baki et de Kirk-Kilise. Une zone démilitarisée sera constituée, qui comprendra le territoire européen de la Turquie et, en territoire hellénique, une bande de terrain comprise entre la frontière gréco-turque définie ci-dessus et une ligne qui suivra la rive

de la mer jusqu'à sa rencontre avec la rivière Pravodia et le cours de cette rivière jusqu'à la frontière bulgare.

Le Gouvernement ottoman accordera toutes facilités pour permettre le développement économique de la ville de Rodosto.

En ce qui concerne les villes d'Andrinople et de Smyrne, il sera assuré dans le Traité de Paix une représentation adéquate des intérêts de la population grecque. Ces stipulations s'inspireront de la Convention de La Haye de 1908 entre la Grèce d'une part, et l'Empire ottoman d'autre part.

Dans les territoires de la zone démilitarisée qui sont ou seront occupés par les Alliés et qui sont définis ci-après, les forces de gendarmerie helléniques ou ottomanes seront subordonnées au Commandement interallié d'occupation de ces territoires.

Cette zone démilitarisée comprend :

1. En Europe

Les côtes de la mer Egée, du Cap Belles à l'embouchure de la Maritza-rive orientale de la Maritza jusqu'à un point situé à 20 kilom. sud d'Andrinople-arr. de cercle ayant Andrinople comme centre, avec le même rayon jusqu'à sa rencontre avec la rivière Pravodia, cours de cette rivière jusqu'à la frontière bulgare-frontière bulgare jusqu'à la mer Noire-côtes de la mer Noire jusqu'au Bosphore (rive ouest) ;

2. En Asie

Les côtes de la mer de Marmara, du Cap Belles à l'embouchure de la Maritza-rive orientale de la Maritza jusqu'à un point situé à 20 kilom. sud d'Andrinople-arr. de cercle ayant Andrinople comme centre, avec le même rayon jusqu'à sa rencontre avec la rivière Pravodia, cours de cette rivière jusqu'à la frontière bulgare-frontière bulgare jusqu'à la mer Noire-côtes de la mer Noire jusqu'au Bosphore (rive ouest) ;

3. Iles

Sont comprises dans la zone démilitarisée :

- (a) Les îles de la mer de Marmara,
- (b) Les îles de Samothrace, Imbros, Tenedos, Lemnos et Mytilène.

Afin d'éviter les contacts armés entre les forces turques et helléniques, et de garantir d'autre part la liberté des Détroits :

1. Dans le délai de trois mois à partir de la mise en vigueur du futur traité, il sera procédé au désarmement et au démantèlement de tous ouvrages, fortifications ou batteries dans une zone comprenant les territoires et îles définies ci-dessus.

Il est interdit d'établir des ouvrages semblables. La France, la Grande-Bretagne et l'Italie auront le droit, dans ladite zone ainsi que dans les îles de Lemnos, Imbros, Samothrace et Tenedos, de préparer la mise hors de service des routes et voies ferrées existantes et pouvant être utilisées pour amener rapidement des batteries mobiles, et dont l'établissement y reste interdit.

Dans les îles de Lemnos, Imbros, Samothrace et Tenedos, l'établissement de nouvelles routes ou voies ferrées ne pourra être entrepris qu'avec l'autorisation des Puissances alliées.

2. Les mesures prévues au paragraphe 1, alinéa premier, seront exécutées, par les Puissances alliées, sous le contrôle prévu à l'article 20.

3. Les territoires et les îles de la zone démilitarisée ne pourront être utilisés militairement, en cas de nécessité, que par les trois Puissances alliées et sous leurs ordres agissant conjointement. Cette disposition n'est pas exclusive de l'emploi dans lesdites zones et îles des forces de gendarmerie et de police helléniques ou ottomanes. La garnison ottomane à Constantinople en plus de la garde personnelle du Sultan.

Toutefois, les effectifs maximum autorisés pour ces forces de gendarmerie et de police seront fixés par le Commandement interallié des Troupes d'occupation visées à l'alinéa 3 ci-dessus.

Il est interdit d'exercer la surveillance sur toute l'étendue de la zone démilitarisée, de manière à empêcher qu'aucune action puisse être effectuée ou préparée qui, directement ou

indirectement, serait susceptible de porter atteinte aux stipulations des alinéas 1, 2 et 3 précédents.

Cette surveillance sera exercée :

1. point de vue naval, par un stationnaire de chacune desdites Puissances alliées,
2. point de vue militaire, par un service d'inspection confié à des officiers alliés, et qui sera organisé dans les conditions fixées par le Commandement international d'Occupation.

5. La Grande-Bretagne, la France et l'Italie agissant conjointement, auront en outre la faculté de maintenir dans la presqu'île de Gallipoli et sur la côte nord de Marmara, jusqu'à lodosio inclus, telles forces militaires et aéronefs qu'elles estimeront nécessaires.

Tout en laissant l'occupation internationale à la région ci-dessus visée, lesdites Puissances se réservent le droit de l'étendre conjointement à d'autres régions de la zone démilitarisée prévue, dans les cas où les stipulations qui font l'objet des présentes dispositions viendraient à être violées.

6. Les forces d'occupation visées ci-dessus, pourront, en outre, à terre le droit de réquisition, dans les mêmes conditions que celles prévues par le Règlement annexé à la Convention IV de La Haye 1907, ou toute autre convention qui viendrait à remplacer celle-ci et à laquelle chacune desdites Puissances serait partie. Toutefois, ces réquisitions ne pourront être effectuées qu'après paiement préalable.

7. La France et l'Italie retireront leurs forces de Constantinople et de la partie de la zone démilitarisée qu'elles doivent évacuer, suivant la marche de l'exécution du traité.

8. Une commission sera constituée dans les quinze jours qui suivront la mise en vigueur du futur traité pour fixer aux places les limites de la partie continentale de la zone démilitarisée prévue ci-dessus. Cette commission sera composée de trois membres respectivement nommés par les autorités militaires de la France, de la Grande-Bretagne et de l'Italie, et, selon les cas, d'un membre nommé par le Gouvernement hellénique ou par le Gouvernement ottoman en ce qui concerne la partie de la zone restant sous la souveraineté ottomane. Les décisions de la commission, prises à la majorité des voix, seront obligatoires pour les parties intéressées.

Les frais de cette commission seront imputés au compte des frais d'occupation de la zone.

ANNEXE 2.

Text of Covering Letter to be signed by the three Foreign Ministers and sent to the Turkish and Angora Ministers for Foreign Affairs and the Greek Minister for Foreign Affairs.

M. le Ministre,

M. le Ministre des Affaires étrangères des trois Puissances alliées, Grande-Bretagne, France et Italie, nous sommes réunis à Paris les 22, 23, 24, 25 et 26 mars, 1919, pour examiner la situation dans le Proche-Orient avec le sincère et ardent désir de parvenir à un nouveau l'ordre et la paix. Nous vous communiquons, sous ce pli, un exposé complet des propositions auxquelles nous avons abouti après ce mûr examen, exposé appuyé des raisons qui justifient ces propositions.

Comme il est d'un intérêt général que cette réunion ait lieu le plus tôt possible, nous vous engageons à fixer à trois semaines de la date de la présente lettre le jour d'ouverture de ces conférences.

Son Excellence Izzet Pacha,
Ministre des Affaires étrangères de Turquie.

[E 3550 5 44]

No. 80.

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received April 1, 1922.)

(No. 305. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 28, 1922.

DURING the last few days I have been very busy with the proposal for an armistice. He said that the Sultan had been anxious by the fact that the question of an armistice was being discussed, or even before the acceptance of the proposal, to have the Sultan and his Government feel that they were making preparations for the taking of the city of Constantinople. There was now danger of the city being taken by the army in Asia Minor.

There was now danger of the city being taken by the army in Asia Minor. The Grand Vizier was very anxious to accept the principle of the evacuation of Asia Minor. After all the evacuation of Asia Minor was one of the main planks in the Kemalist or, indeed, Turkish platform. The Grand Vizier assented. He then proceeded to discuss Izzet Pasha in terms which were not altogether flattering to the latter.

He said that he did not seem to be able to take any responsibility on himself. He referred to the Central Government on every conceivable subject. As an instance of Izzet Pasha's want of discretion, the Grand Vizier informed me that he had received a telegram from him yesterday to the effect that the Greeks should be given Constantinople and the territory behind it. On the other hand, the Greek and Roumanian representatives at Constantinople, the Grand Vizier said, were very surprised by its contents. To begin with the Turkish Government were not in official relations with either the Serb or the Roumanian representatives, and the Grand Vizier said that Izzet Pasha that he could not take action on reports of the nature in question.

4. Discussing the probable attitude of the Angora Government towards the proposal, he said that he had no information from any source as to the attitude of the Angora Government towards that proposal. He had no information as to the attitude of the Angora Government towards that proposal.

Yours faithfully,
HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner.

[E 3552/5/44]

No. 81.

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received April 3, 1922.)

(No. 307.)

HIS Majesty's representative at Constantinople presents his compliments to His Majesty the King and begs to acknowledge the receipt of the copy of a note from the Turkish Government respecting the proposed armistice between Greek and Turkish armies.

Constantinople, March 28, 1922.

Enclosure in No. 81.

Tevfik Pasha to Sir H. Rumbold

M. le Haut-Commissaire,
Sublime Porte, le 26 mars 1922.
M. le Haut-Commissaire, j'ai l'honneur de vous adresser ci-joint une note collective du 23 mars courant que les Hauts-Commissaires de Grande-Bretagne, d'Italie et de France

ont bien voulu me remettre, par ordre de leurs Gouvernements respectifs, au sujet de la conclusion d'un armistice entre les armées turques et hellènes.

En réponse, je m'empresse d'informer votre Excellence que la question de l'armistice entre les deux belligérants n'étant pas uniquement du ressort de la Sublime Porte, la copie de la susdite note a été de suite communiquée à Mustapha Kemal Pacha, conformément au désir exprimé verbalement par votre Excellence et vos collègues. Je me réserve donc de transmettre à votre Excellence une réponse à ce sujet dès que

ment que la susdite note de votre Excellence annonçant
sur les troupes helléniques les territoires occupés en Asie
chaque mention de celle de la Thrace, y compris Andrianople
sans laquelle la capitale de l'Empire ne saurait être considérée hors du danger d'une
agression future

Veuillez agréer, &
TEVETIK

E 3553 96 85

N. 2

Sur H. Humbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston (Received April 3.)

(No. 308.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 29, 1921

WITH reference to my despatch, No. 58 of the 16th January last, and previous correspondence relative to the Kurdish question, I have the honour to state that reported from a reliable source that the commission of the Great National Assembly, to

drawn up by the special commission recently returned the draft law with the special commission's report to the Assembly. When the matter came up for debate in the Assembly an adverse motion was immediately proposed by Saah Effendi (Erzurum), Yusuf Izzet Pasha (Bolu), Rauf Bey (Amassia), Hakki Hamed Bey (Sinope) and Balahadim Bey (Moussa).

2. Yusuf Izzet Pasha, Rauf Bey and Hakki Hamed Bey were members of the commission which was sent to enquire into the causes of the rebellion of the Kutch Kuri Kurds.

3. The motion was accepted by the majority, and it was decided that there should be a secret debate on the 10th February. At the secret sitting, which was held accordingly, there was a large number of Deputies, including almost all the members of the National Defence Party. The number of Deputies opposing the draft law was sixty four, and as there were a number of Deputies who had not decided which way they would vote, the leader of the Defence of Rights Party had sent an urgent whip to all the members of that party to be present.

4. Saah Effendi opened the debate with a speech in which he argued that the proposed law, and that although the departments interested wished to veto the law

Mustapha Pasha was to be calmed, those who had been impressed on account of the Kutch Kuri disorders should be released, and in the interests of the country the

when the country was at war with the Greeks it would not be easy to deal with the situation in that manner. The rising was due to the tyranny of the Administration and to the attitude of the Angora Government towards the Caliphate. The use of violence would only aggravate the situation. It was nonsense to say that there was no revolt in Kurdistan, for one had no need of a guide when the village could be plainly seen. The movement is being supported by the Emir Feraid and the British, and in the interests of the country the matter should be dealt with without using violence.

5. During Saah Effendi's speech there were constant interruptions from the

mostly resulted in an increase of the tumult, which led to a protest from the Deputy for Erzurum, Doruk Bey, who exclaimed that the Assembly was being turned into an infants school.

6. In order to put an end to the confusion a number of Deputies put forward a motion to the effect that Saah Effendi's motion should be discussed on a later occasion when further reports had been received from Djeval Pasha.

7. The motion was accepted and the sitting came to an end.

8. The following is a summary of the draft law referred to.

(1.) The Great National Assembly of Turkey, with the object of
program of the Turkish nation in accordance
civilization, undertakes to establish an auto
Kurdish nation in harmony with their anti

of which are in the majority Kurds, a Governor
chosen by the dignitaries of that nation together with an
As

General who must
rejoice administrator, with an honourable reputation, and
all the Kurdish nation.

General shall be nominated for three years, at the expiration of
General shall be made by
ty of the Kurdish nation

to decide whether the Assistant
a Kurd, he shall nevertheless be
elected directly by the Kurdish Nation

the Governor-General, the Assistant Governor-General and the Inspector

to complete its labours, the period may be prolonged at the request
of a clear majority of members and with the approval of the Governor-General

to complete its labours, the period may be prolonged at the request
of a clear majority of members and with the approval of the Governor-General

to complete its labours, the period may be prolonged at the request
of a clear majority of members and with the approval of the Governor-General

to complete its labours, the period may be prolonged at the request
of a clear majority of members and with the approval of the Governor-General

(6.) The Great National Assembly shall decide in all disputes between the
Governor-General and the Kurdish Assembly, and both parties must
to its decision.

(7.) Pending the settlement of boundaries by a mixed commission the
two areas of Kurdistan shall consist of the provinces of Van
and the sanjak of Derun together with certain

(10.) With regard to the administration of Kurdistan a judicial organization shall
be created in harmony with local usages for special areas. For the time
being this organization shall consist of competent officials, half of whom
shall be Turkish and other half Kurdish. Upon retirement of the Turkish
officials they may be replaced by Kurds.

(11.) From the date of the application of this law no taxes shall be imposed either
under the form of war contribution or any other form. All fiscal contributions
hitherto in vigour shall be abandoned at the discretion of the local
administration, and payments of taxes shall be made once a year only. The
proportion of net revenue to be paid to the Angora Government shall be
settled by a mixed commission consisting of Deputies of the Great National
Assembly of Angora and the Kurdish National Assembly.

(12.) A corps of gendarmerie shall be formed to maintain order in the eastern
provinces. The Kurdish Assembly shall elaborate the law governing the
body, but the chief administration of the gendarmerie shall be in the
of high Turkish officials until their services are no longer required.

(13.) Kurdish officers and soldiers in the Turkish army shall remain in their present
service until the conclusion of peace, when those who desire may return to
their own country.

[8975]

222

- (14.) After the conclusion of peace the value of all animals and materials requisitioned both during and after the general war shall be a first charge, and shall be paid within twelve months at the latest.
- (15.) The Turkish language only shall be employed in the Kurdish National Assembly, the service of the Governorate and in the administration of the Government. The Kurdish language, however, may be taught in the schools and shall not be made the basis of any future demand for the recognition of the Kurdish language as the official language of the Government.
- (16.) The primary duty of the Kurdish National Assembly shall be to found a university with a law and medical faculty.
- (17.) No tax whatever may be imposed by the Kurdish National Assembly without the approval of the Governor-General and before the Great National Assembly of Angora.
- (18.) No concessions of any kind shall be granted without first consulting the Great National Assembly of Angora and securing its consent.

It will be understood from this summary why the draft law was opposed with such energy by the Kurdish Deputies as described above.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD

High Commissioner

E 3555 S 44]

No. 63

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received April 3.)

(No. 310.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, March 28, 1922

I HAVE the honour to report that the local press has been discussing the proposed armistice between the Greeks and the Turks for the last few days. Comment in the Turkish press is generally unfavourable to the proposal.

2. In the "Yakt," of the 24th March, Ahmed Emin Bey states that, if the Turks laid down their arms now they would be committing suicide. He regards the proposal as a piece of propaganda calculated to sap their energy.

In the "Hert," Sabur Nuri urges resistance and adherence to the terms of the National Pact.

4. In the "Tehrik-i Efk ar," Vehid Bey explains that an armistice is only possible when one of the belligerents admits defeat, and this is not the case with the Turks or Greeks. In spite of demotions the Greek troops are still resisting on their front. He thinks that the Turks did reject the proposal.

5. The "Yakt," of the 24th March, comments the proposed armistice as favourable to the Greeks and prejudicial to the Turks. He would like an armistice, under the terms of which the Greeks would have to evacuate Smyrna and Thrace.

6. The "Hert" says that the Turks want more than an armistice, they want peace, but on the condition that the Greeks first take their departure. This armistice proposal means leaving the Greeks three months longer in Anatolia and Thrace. The dominant feeling in Angora is that the conclusion of the armistice would be most prejudicial to the interests of the country.

The "Fevk-i Akademi" writes that the proposal has produced a very bad impression in all quarters. It is calculated to give Greece time to improve her position. Anatolia is convinced that she cannot reach an arrangement with Greece except by force of arms. There is not a Musulman in Anatolia but is determined to have vengeance of Greece. Everyone in Anatolia has sworn to throw the Greeks into the sea. Although not bellicose, the leaders at Angora cannot consent to arrangements likely to weaken the army. On this point Anatolia and Constantinople are agreed. If there is no armistice, the Greeks will be forced eventually to abandon their positions and retreat.

8. The "Hert," of the 25th March, says that this armistice proposal is like the armistice agreement of Mudros. The Turks will never again accept such an armistice. For this armistice proposal to be acceptable to the nation, the occupied territory should first of all be evacuated. Those who wish to bring about peace with Turkey must promise the literal execution of the National Pact. It refers to the hasty

departure of Yusuf Kemal Bey from Paris for Angora, and wonders if he is the bearer of other proposals. If he brings secret proposals from the *Entente* Powers which can be made to harmonise with the National Pact peace in the East is assured.

9. According to the Anatolian agency of the 24th March, the "Hakimiyet-i Milliye," the organ of the Angora Government, after commenting on the peace proposals and asserting that Turkey, above all other nations, wants peace and would joyfully welcome any peace proposals under which Turkey could attain the terms of the National Pact, concludes:

"'Once bitten twice shy.' The tenor of the proposals is so vague and the intentions so veiled that one cannot hazard a guess as to what they are."

"At the beginning the last of the evacuation of Anatolia is held out to us, but no word can be found about what is to follow the evacuation. The only matters which stand out clearly are that the time limit of the armistice is to be extended and that the Allies wish to send a commission to control all movements of the belligerents during the armistice."

"We have never heard of such a preposterous suggestion."

We are asked to give *carte blanche* control of our forces to the Powers, who have not as yet made known the nature of their demands, and between whom and ourselves is the obstacle of the *Sèvres* Treaty. They must take us for fools or children.

"At the least, they might have told us how our territories were to be evacuated and given us a guarantee of national independence; but no, we are to hand over control of our forces and then wait for what they will do."

"Had the document not been signed by three foreign Ministers and by three High Commissioners it could only be considered as a farce. Such terms as are offered could nowhere be accepted."

"Our nation, which has suffered so much, would not allow a Government who accepted such terms to exist for two minutes."

"The proposals were made to be refused."

"Gomaris, on his return, stated this truth. The terms were intended to make us appear as chauvinistic."

"Those who keep their clear-sightedness can, after reading the document, see the sort of people who retard the making of peace. To resume, it is necessary, if the nation wishes to accept any terms, to—

"(1.) Guarantee the complete evacuation of all occupied territories and to control it."

"(2.) Any peace terms must conform to the National Pact."

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,

High Commissioner.

E 3561 S 44]

No. 84

Sir H. Graham to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received April 3.)

(No. 292.)

My Lord,

Rome, March 31, 1922

WITH reference to my despatch No. 276 of the 24th instant, I have the honour to report that the results of the Paris discussions on the Near Eastern question have been received without any enthusiasm and with some severe criticism.

The fact that the "Adhed front" has been re-established, even if it is welcomed by the more serious newspapers, is a sign of the

fact that the "Adhed front" has been re-established, even if it is welcomed by the more serious newspapers, is a sign of the

fact that the "Adhed front" has been re-established, even if it is welcomed by the more serious newspapers, is a sign of the

fact that the "Adhed front" has been re-established, even if it is welcomed by the more serious newspapers, is a sign of the

fact that the "Adhed front" has been re-established, even if it is welcomed by the more serious newspapers, is a sign of the

The "Stampa" and various other papers attribute to Signor Schanzer the credit for finding a possibly practical solution of the Armenian difficulty.

approve
home

has always been firmly opposed. Several newspapers, however, think that the modifications now proposed are insufficient. The "Presse" thinks that British policy is still too philistine. The "Corriere d'Italia" believes that only the first steps to a solution have been taken. The "Popolo Romano" is of a similar opinion. The "Mondo" fears that the conditions now offered cannot satisfy the Turks, and complains that the programme on behalf of Italy will "pave the road of projects and

The "Giornale d'Italia" and the "Times" policy which sent the

larger on what it considers a far greater failure, the defeat of paints a gloomy picture of the future for England, France considering that the operation is "most clamorous for England to be permanently in regard to the 'future' of the Eastern question in their favour, and the

the press is critical but serious opinion here is

as could be hoped for in view of the past and of the divergence.

I have, &c.

R. G. KAHAM

E 4292 5 44

No. 65

Mr. Arncliffe-Smith to Treasury (communicated to Foreign Office, April 1)

Sir

29, York Terrace, London, April 3, 1

I HAVE the honour to submit the following report as to my proceedings in connection with the duty which the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have done me the honour to entrust to me of representing them in connection with the revision of the financial clauses of the Treaty of Sèvres.

From a study of the papers referred to me with respect to Turkish finance from the date of the last revision of the financial clauses of the treaty to the present time, I infer that the present objects of His Majesty's Government are twofold viz. (1) to avoid as far as possible any unnecessary intervention in, or responsibility for, Turkish financial administration, and (2) to recover any sums which can be recovered from Turkey in respect of the heavy charges which have been incurred (chiefly by His Majesty's Government) on account of the military occupation of Turkish territory since the date of the armistice.

It also appeared from these papers that His Majesty's Government were disposed to await an expression of the views of the French and Italian Governments before putting forward any definite proposals for the revision of the financial clauses.

Before the conference of the three Foreign Ministers at Paris (21st to 26th March) I attended several days at the Foreign Office for the purpose of unofficial discussion, in particular of draft clauses which had been prepared by the Italian Government and communicated confidentially to the Foreign Office. Further reference will be made to this draft below.

Before describing the results of the Paris Conference it may be convenient to recall the main features of the financial settlement as proposed by the Treaty of Sèvres and the circumstances under which that settlement (mainly the work of the British representatives) was drawn up.

The financial clauses of the treaty aimed at obtaining for the three Powers—France, Great Britain and Italy—a complete and effective control over Turkish finance, with the object of restoring solvency and economic prosperity to Turkey at

possessions enjoyed a far greater proportion of the foreign trade of Turkey than any this country

The methods by which this object was to be attained were as follows

A Commission was to be set up, consisting of representatives of the three Powers to control not only Turkish revenues but also Turkish expenditure. Not only was the commission to control the revenue administration, through the Turkish Inspectorate, which would be placed under its orders, but it was also to have a veto on all expenditure, and no budget was to be presented to the Assembly without the prior approval of the commission.

By the protection of the rights of the holders of the pre-war public debt, of the legitimate claims of the Allied Governments, both in respect of their own losses (cost of military occupation) and of those of their nationals, the admirable administrative machinery of the Council of the Debt was to be preserved, and the Commission was to become merged in the Financial

Thus financial control would be exercised by a small expert body consisting of representatives of the three Powers more directly interested in Turkey, instead of representatives of private bond-holders.

The Financial Commission was also charged with the duty of taking such measures as might seem practicable for restoring, or, at any rate, stabilising, the paper currency issued by the Ottoman Empire during the war.

This scheme was virtually complete before the date of the armistice with Turkey, it was complete in all details when the British delegates went to Paris for the Peace Conference (18th January, 1919) and within three months of the opening of the conference we had overcome the opposition of the French and Italian delegates, whose proposals were designed rather to attain minor objects of national interest than the economic reconstruction of the reduced Turkish Empire.

In the opinion of those best qualified to judge, the scheme was practicable and likely to be received willingly by the Porte had it been presented at once.

But it was not presented until eighteen months later, and in the interval the strong national sentiment of the Anatolian Turks had become organised and embittered, the centre of political influence had shifted from Constantinople to Angora, and the financial section, like other portions of the Treaty of Sèvres, proved unacceptable.

Since the rejection of the treaty by the Anatolian Turks conditions have changed rapidly and for the worse.

The Greek troops, having begun a campaign in Anatolia with the permission of the Allies, continued it against the will of the Allies, and their invasion has proven indecisive.

The ravages of war from which European Turkey had suffered have now been extended to the other continent; national feeling has become exacerbated and a powerful foreign ally has come to the aid of the Government of Angora.

The task of restoring the financial equilibrium to Turkey by inter-Allied control, possible at the date when the Peace Conference opened in its possible now, control which would have been welcomed then, is now indignantly repudiated, the Allies have lost any power they possessed of imposing control by force, even if they looked to do so, while it is notorious that one at least of the Powers is opposed to exercising any pressure whatever on the Turkish Government.

These, briefly, are the conditions under which the problem had to be reviewed at Paris in March 1920.

In accordance with what I understand to have been the views of the British Government, I wanted for the French and Italian Governments proposals.

As to the Italian

In private conversation his paper was in effect a compromise between two prominent views, his own, which faced the realities of the situation, and those of his Government, which have since been abandoned.

The views of the French delegates (M. des Cluses, the French representative on the Council of the Debt, and M. Besson, Inspecteur des Finances), were produced before a meeting of all the delegates at the Hotel Crillon, in Paris, during the conference.

Briefly, the French scheme was of the same character as the Italian, it still

proposed control, but an incomplete and ineffective control which was open to most of the political objections which may be urged against a real control and was quite useless for the purpose of restoring the finances of the country.

I then proposed the following principles, which, after some discussion, were accepted unanimously by the Committee of the Council of Foreign Ministers.

Frankly abandoned

The Powers should confine themselves to obtaining from Turkey—(1) repayment of the pre-war debt, (2) payment of their claims for expenses of military occupation, past and future, and for losses by their nationals.

The first principle involves the entire abolition of the Financial Commission and attribution of all responsibility for Turkish currency and finance.

The second involves two results, viz.

The Council of the Debt to be left with its existing constitution (save for the absence of representatives of the enemy Powers, whose rejection is already enacted by the Treaty of Versailles), and with the revenues at present assigned to it.

(b) A Liquidation Commission to be set up to save what it can from the wreck for the purpose of satisfying the Allied claims specified above.

Thus there will be two debt-collecting agencies: one governmental, the other private. The Council will remain a body representative of foreign bond holders; the commission will represent the three Powers primarily concerned. Each will have its own assigned revenues, but their functions will be completely distinct.

Further, it was agreed that the simplest procedure would be to impose on Turkey the heaviest charge which she could bear without bringing the administration to a standstill. (This charge will in any case be far less than the total amount of the Allied claims.) The charge will take the form of an annuity run

for twenty years, subject to the possibility of reduction should the

This scheme, which is strongly urged by the Board of Trade, has the merit of avoiding all contentious questions of priority as between the Allies themselves, for of military occupation and private claims at its discretion.

It will involve, of course, the examination of the validity and extent of all claims preferred and agreement upon the totals as a preliminary to the assessment of a proportion which each Power is to receive, but this procedure would be inevitable.

percentage

The allocation of even a proportion of the bonds, which will, of course, be negotiable, the Smyrna-Aidin Railway will afford a certain amount of immediate relief.

It will be time to elaborate details when the main outlines of the Paris settlements have been accepted.

To the extent described above there was complete agreement amongst the delegates, all of whom after discussion realised the uselessness of incomplete control (control over revenue without control over expenditure), and the inexpediency of claiming an appearance of control which would involve responsibility without power. Indeed, three of the delegates had personally experienced the inconvenience of such a system as illustrated by the Provisional Financial Commission of Control which has recently been set up at Constantinople.

The revenues upon which it is proposed to take a charge for securing the liquidation annuity are:—

(a) Customs, tithe and "agham" (sheep-tax).

Any surplus at the disposal of the Turkish Government on revenues from existing or future concessions.

It is also provided that the Liquidation Commission shall be free to adopt such methods as may seem best to it for securing the proper administration of the hypothecated revenues.

With regard to these two points it is to be observed that (a) gives the Allies a basis for controlling the customs revenue. I understand that it has been the desire of His Majesty's Government to secure the appointment of a British subject as controller of customs. Such an object can presumably be obtained by agreement between the three Powers under this provision without specific mention in the treaty. (b) was insisted at the urgent instance of the Italians.

At the beginning of the conference the Italian Minister (Signor Schanzer) declared that he would be unable to take part in the conference unless the revised treaty provided expressly for the recognition of the pledges given by the Tripartite Agreement.

By this agreement it will be remembered the three Powers undertook to secure the economic interest for Turkey.

what they think they obtained from the Tripartite Agreement that the proposal was made to take a charge on concession revenue for the liquidation annuity.

The proposals of the financial experts were accepted by the three Foreign Ministers without comment, save that M. Poincaré expressed a desire that the amount of the annuity should be expressed in other denominations besides sterling.

I proposed as a preliminary to the examination of the validity and extent of all claims preferred and agreement upon the totals as a preliminary to the assessment of a proportion which each Power is to receive, but this procedure would be inevitable.

I propose in a few days to submit a preliminary draft of the financial clauses themselves, including the somewhat complicated and detailed provisions those points upon which I propose for Ministerial decision.

I have, &c.

SYDNEY A. ARMITAGE-SMITH.

Statement of Principles for the Revision of the Financial Clauses

LES circonstances actuelles ne permettent plus l'établissement d'un contrôle effectif sur les finances et l'administration ottomanes. Dans ces conditions, la création d'une commission financière, qui ne posséderait que des pouvoirs insuffisants, et ne pourrait, par conséquent, exercer qu'une action illusoire, doit être abandonnée.

C'est donc, d'un autre côté, il serait impolitique de proposer des mesures de nature à soulever contre le Traité de Paix le nationalisme turc, les experts soussignés soumettent les propositions suivantes :

1. Il ne sera pas prévu dans le Texte de l'Acte un contrôle général sur les finances ottomanes.
2. Le décret de Mouharrém, les décrets antérieurs, ainsi que tous les contrats des emprunts énumérés à l'Article I des clauses financières sont confirmés.
3. Il sera tenu, cependant, compte des décisions du Traité de Versailles supprimant les fonctions de délégués allemands et autrichiens au Conseil de l'Empire ottoman.
4. Le principe des parts contributives à verser par les puissances alliées à l'Empire ottoman et leur mode de calcul sont maintenus.
5. L'indemnité des frais d'occupation militaires des Puissances alliées depuis l'armistice jusqu'à la mise en vigueur du Traité de Paix et après la mise en vigueur du traité, ainsi que les réclamations des ressortissants alliés avant, pendant et après la guerre, il sera créé une Commission de Liquidation composée des représentants des trois principales Puissances alliées, qui aura les attributions indiquées plus lo.
6. La Turquie s'engage à verser à cette Commission de Liquidation pendant vingt années une annuité de 5,000,000 de livres sterling.* Toutefois, pendant les premières années, la Commission aura le droit de ne réclamer à la Turquie qu'une somme de 3,000,000 de livres sterling par an, étant entendu que la différence entre la somme totale due par la Turquie soit versée en livres sterling, et ladite somme de 3,000,000 de livres sterling sera répartie sur les années suivantes.
7. Pour assurer le paiement de cette annuité, le Gouvernement ottoman devra affecter irrévocablement en garantie les excédents restant libres, des recettes du Trésor, et des autres ressources du Gouvernement dans le produit des excroissances existantes ou à créer.
8. La commission déterminera les moyens qu'elle jugera opportuns pour assurer la gestion des revenus soumis en gage.

Enclosure 2 in No. 85

Concession Claim adopted at the Instance of the Italian Representatives.

LE Gouvernement ottoman demandera l'avis de la Commission de Liquidation, avant promulgation, des contrats des nouvelles concessions ou de la prorogation des concessions existantes à accorder au faveur de ressortissants ottomans ou de tous autres.

Afin de permettre à la Commission de liquidation d'accomplir la mission qui lui est confiée, le représentant de la Commission sera autorisé à solliciter auprès du Département ministériel compétent toutes les facilités requises par le représentant que la Commission désignera.

Supplementary Note to be signed by the Powers

DANS le cas où la Commission de Liquidation cesserait de fonctionner et avant la cessation de ses fonctions, les trois principales Puissances alliées se concerteraient sur les mesures à prendre pour assurer par d'autres moyens que ceux prévus au Traité de Paix avec la Turquie l'exécution de l'Accord tripartite en ce qui concerne les concessions réservées à chacune desdites Puissances.

E 3532 5 44⁷

No. 96

Count de Saint-Aulaire to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received April 5.)

M. POINCARÉ a fait parvenir à l'Ambassadeur de France un certain nombre de textes sur lesquels les trois Ministres des Affaires étrangères alliés se sont mis d'accord à Paris afin de préciser les conditions dans lesquelles devra se poursuivre leur action en vue du rétablissement de la paix.

Ces textes sont les suivants :

1. Un programme d'évacuation de l'Asie Mineure par les forces heléniques.
2. Une résolution relative à la protection à assurer aux minorités en Grèce et en
3. Une résolution relative aux frontières de Turquie en Thrace et au régime
4. Un projet de clauses à insérer dans le Traité de Paix pour la démilitarisation de la Thrace et de la zone des Détroits.
5. Une résolution relative aux forces armées que la Turquie sera autorisée à conserver.
6. Une résolution relative aux dispositions financières à insérer dans le Traité de Paix et un projet de rédaction de l'article relatif aux concessions en
7. Une résolution relative à la substitution d'un régime nouveau au régime des Capitulations en matière fiscale et judiciaire.

Quelques-uns de ces documents ont dû subir de très légères modifications nécessaires pour donner à des propositions d'experts la forme de textes adoptés. Sur deux points, cependant, ils ne reproduisent pas intégralement les réductions :

La proportion des troupes turques sera la même que celle des troupes russes, c'est-à-dire de 100,000 hommes. Les forces armées de la Turquie, de l'égalité proportion que les trois Ministres ont convenus d'observer entre les officiers de leur nationalité qui seraient mis à la disposition du Gouvernement ottoman. Cette proportion les intéresse, en effet, exclusivement.

D'autre part, il n'a pas été pris de mesures dans laquelle seraient fixées les annuités

L'Ambassadeur de France a été chargé de soumettre d'urgence ces textes au Principal Secrétaire d'Etat de Sa Majesté pour les Affaires étrangères et le prier de lui faire connaître son accord le plus tôt possible. Il est en effet indispensable que, aussitôt que les Gouvernements intéressés auraient accepté l'armistice et le principe de la conférence à laquelle ils sont conviés, il puisse leur être donné communication de ces textes qui doivent servir de base à leurs travaux.

Le Comte de Saint-Aulaire nous, etc.

Ambassade de France, Londres,
le 4 avril 1922

Resolutions, etc.

1. Programme d'Evacuation de l'Asie Mineure.

Pour que l'évacuation de l'Asie Mineure par les troupes helléniques et sa réoccupation par l'armée turque puissent avoir lieu sans effusion de sang et sans devastations, il est nécessaire que les armées helléniques et turques soient réciproquement garanties contre toute reprise des hostilités même partielle au cours de leurs mouvements; que les populations et leurs biens soient garantis contre toutes exactions ou représailles de la part de l'une ou de l'autre des armées; que les opérations soient préparées et réglées suivant un programme général établi à l'avance

avec les Hauts-Commandements hellénique et turc, puis d'en diriger et d'en contrôler l'exécution et qu'ils soient investis à cet effet des pouvoirs nécessaires pour régler les incidents qui pourraient se produire à cette occasion.

Le programme comportera notamment: (1) la réorganisation préalable de l'administration civile du pays et des forces de sécurité locale.

Les gouvernements intéressés sont invités à reconnaître la direction générale des opérations d'évacuation, de l'organe interallié qui son siège à Smyrne, et à prendre toutes mesures pour que les décisions de cet organe soient strictement exécutées par leurs troupes ou par les agents de leurs administrations civiles.

Les Alliés ne sauraient en aucun cas accepter la responsabilité du maintien de l'ordre lors de l'évacuation, non plus que le contrôle direct de l'administration civile, dans chaque zone, ce soin incombera aux autorités grecques jusqu'à évacuation, et aux autorités ottomanes dès le départ des troupes helléniques.

2. Minorités.

Les gouvernements intéressés sont invités à reconnaître la responsabilité de l'administration civile, dans chaque zone, ce soin incombera aux autorités grecques jusqu'à évacuation, et aux autorités ottomanes dès le départ des troupes helléniques.

Les Alliés ne sauraient en aucun cas accepter la responsabilité du maintien de l'ordre lors de l'évacuation, non plus que le contrôle direct de l'administration civile, dans chaque zone, ce soin incombera aux autorités grecques jusqu'à évacuation, et aux autorités ottomanes dès le départ des troupes helléniques.

Les Alliés ne sauraient en aucun cas accepter la responsabilité du maintien de l'ordre lors de l'évacuation, non plus que le contrôle direct de l'administration civile, dans chaque zone, ce soin incombera aux autorités grecques jusqu'à évacuation, et aux autorités ottomanes dès le départ des troupes helléniques.

zones suivantes: (1) Asie: a) Smyrne, dans le Pont, dans les vilayets de l'est et du sud-est, en Cilicie, et (2) Europe: en Thrace et en Thessalie. Ces commissaires auront pour mission, sous le contrôle général du Haut-Commissaire du Conseil de la Société des Nations à Constantinople, de faire des visites périodiques dans les zones en question et, de concert avec les autorités locales, de prendre les mesures nécessaires pour protéger les minorités conformément aux clauses du traité. Lesdits commissaires feront directement des rapports au conseil de la Société des Nations et les soumettront à la réunion annuelle de l'Assemblée de la Société, pour permettre aux nations représentées à l'Assemblée d'être en mesure d'assurer la fidèle exécution les stipulations pour lesquelles la Société aura accordé sa garantie.

3. Arménie.

Les trois Puissances, conscientes des engagements, qu'elles ont publiquement pris en tant d'occasions, d'assurer au peuple arménien une existence libre et indépendante, ont décidé d'inviter la Société des Nations à assumer la responsabilité spéciale de l'exécution des garanties qui sont recommandées pour la protection des minorités, aussi bien en Europe qu'en Asie, et ont proposé que la Turquie, après conclusion de la paix, sera admise comme membre de cette Société. Les Puissances estiment qu'il ne pourra se présenter d'occasion plus favorable de donner satisfaction aux demandes des Arméniens, qui, nous le voyons au nombre qu'en importance, sont au premier rang de ces minorités. Les demandes des Arméniens se résument dans l'aspiration générale de se voir réserver un foyer national dans l'une ou l'autre des zones de l'Asie Mineure où ils ont jusqu'ici résidé en nombre considérable. Le choix de la région où ce foyer pourra le mieux être assuré dépend de conditions politiques, économiques et sociales sur lesquelles il est actuellement impossible de se prononcer définitivement. Toutefois, les Puissances recommanderont particulièrement à la Société des Nations d'entrer, aussitôt après la conclusion de la paix, en rapport avec le Gouvernement ottoman, à l'effet de créer un tel foyer national pour les Arméniens, et de s'efforcer de déterminer les conditions auxquelles il peut être réalisé et pourvu des garanties nécessaires à son existence future. A cet effet, les trois Puissances proposent de donner toute l'assistance possible, convenant que la solution finale du problème arménien est également désirable dans l'intérêt des Arméniens, de la Turquie et de la paix de l'Orient.

4. Thrace.

La frontière en Europe entre la Grèce et la Turquie suivra la trace suivante: elle partira d'un point à choisir à l'ouest de Canoe sur la mer de Marmara, suivra la vallée de l'Ank pour aboutir à la frontière bulgare, dans le massif occidental des monts Rhodope, longeant en territoire grec les villes de Baba-Baki et de Kerk Kiliou. Une zone sera constituée, qui comprendra le territoire européen de la Turquie et, en territoire hellénique, l'espace compris entre la frontière grecque-turque d'une part et une ligne qui suivra la rive orientale de la Maritza, de son embouchure à un point situé à 20 kilom. au sud d'Andrinople, un arc de cercle de même rayon ayant Andrinople pour centre tracé à l'est de la ville jusqu'à sa rencontre avec la rivière l'Aravodja et le cours de cette rivière jusqu'à la frontière bulgare.

Le Gouvernement ottoman accordera toutes facilités pour permettre le développement économique de la ville de Rodosto.

En ce qui concerne les villes d'Andrinople et de Smyrne, il sera inséré dans le Traité de Paix des stipulations assurant la protection et la représentation adéquate des divers éléments ethniques et religieux de ces deux villes. Ces stipulations s'inspireront notamment du projet de traité signé le 10 août 1920 entre la Grèce d'une part, et l'Empire britannique, la France, l'Italie et le Japon d'autre part.

5. Zone de démilitarisation.

Dans ceux des territoires de la zone démilitarisée qui sont ou seront occupés par les Alliés et qui sont définis ci-après, les forces de gendarmerie helléniques ou ottomanes seront subordonnées au commandement interallié d'occupation de ces territoires.

Cette zone démilitarisée comprend:

1. En Europe.

Côtes de la mer Egée: du cap Helles à l'embouchure de la Maritza-rives orientales de la Maritza jusqu'à un point situé à 20 kilom. au sud d'Andrinople-arc de cercle

ayant Andrinople comme centre, avec le même rayon jusqu'à sa rencontre avec la rivière Pravodja, cours de cette rivière jusqu'à la frontière bulgare-frontière bulgare jusqu'à la mer Noire cotes de la mer Noire jusqu'au Bosphore (rive ouest).

2. En 1914

Bosphore (rive est) côtes de la mer Noire jusqu'au cap situé à 18 kilom. est de Sile-ligne allant de ce cap au cap de Yarıncı (golfe d'Ismid)-côtes de la mer de Marmara au cap de Yarıncı, à l'isthme séparant du continent la presqu'île d'Artaki ligne traversant cet isthme dans sa partie la plus étroite, côte de la Marmara jusqu'au point où la frontière du sandjak de Tchanak aboutit sur la Marmara. frontière du sandjak jusqu'à son débouché dans le golfe d'Adramit.

3. Il est

Sont compris dans la zone démilitarisée

(a.) Les îles de la mer de Marmara.

(b.) Les îles de Samothrace, Imbros, Tenedos, Lemnos et Mytilène.

En vue d'éviter les contacts armés entre les forces turques et helléniques, et de garantir d'autre part la liberté des Détroits :

1. Dans le délai de trois mois à partir de la mise en vigueur du futur traité, il sera procédé au démantèlement et au désarmement de tous ouvrages, fortifications ou batteries dans une zone comprenant les territoires et îles définies ci-dessus.

Il sera procédé également dans le même délai à l'enlèvement et à la destruction de tous organes de défense maritime (tubes lance-torpilles, lignes de torpilles, filets ou obstructions de toute nature, projecteurs, etc.) existant ou dans les eaux de la mer Noire.

Sont interdites, dans la zone et dans ces îles, la reconstruction de ces ouvrages et la construction d'ouvrages semblables. La France, la Grande-Bretagne et l'Italie auront le droit, dans la zone, ainsi que dans les îles de Lemnos, Imbros, Samothrace et Tenedos, de préparer la mise hors de service des routes et voies ferrées existantes et pouvant être utilisées pour amener rapidement des batteries mobiles, et dont l'établissement y reste interdit.

Dans les îles de Lemnos, Imbros, Samothrace et Tenedos, l'établissement de nouvelles routes ou voies ferrées ne pourra être entrepris qu'avec l'autorisation des trois Puissances ci-dessus mentionnées.

2. Les mesures prévues au paragraphe 1, alinéa premier, seront exécutées, par les soins et aux frais de la Grèce et de la Turquie, ou de ce qui concerne leurs territoires respectifs et sous le contrôle prévu à l'article.

3. Les territoires ainsi que les eaux, ports et rades de la zone démilitarisée et les îles qu'elle comprend ne pourront être utilisés militairement, en cas de nécessité que pour la police et la surveillance. Cette disposition n'est pas exclusive de l'emploi dans lesdites zones et îles des forces de gendarmerie et de police helléniques ou ottomanes nécessaires pour y maintenir l'ordre, non plus que d'une garnison hellénique dans l'île de Mytilène, et d'une garnison ottomane à Constantinople ou plus de la garde personnelle du Sultan.

Toutefois, les effectifs maximum autorisés pour ces forces de gendarmerie et de police et pour ces garnisons seront fixés en considération du service à assurer, par le commandement international des troupes d'occupation visées à l'alinéa 3 ci-dessus.

4. La Grande-Bretagne, la France et l'Italie agissant conjointement auront la faculté d'exercer la surveillance sur toute l'étendue de la zone démilitarisée, de manière à empêcher qu'aucune action puisse être effectuée ou préparée qui direct ou indirectement, serait susceptible de porter atteinte aux stipulations des

cette surveillance sera exercée

Au point de vue naval, par un stationnaire de chacune desdites Puissances alliées.

Au point de vue militaire, par un service d'inspection confié à des officiers alliés, et qui sera organisé dans les conditions fixées par le commandement international d'occupation.

5. La Grande-Bretagne, la France et l'Italie, agissant conjointement, auront en outre la faculté de maintenir dans la presqu'île de Gallipoli et sur la côte nord de Marmara, jusqu'à Rodosto inclus, telles forces militaires et aériennes qu'elles

font en limitant l'occupation internationale à la région ci-dessus visée, lesdites zones démilitarisées prévues, dans le cas où les stipulations qui font l'objet des présentes dispositions viendraient à être violées.

Les forces d'occupation visées, ci-dessus, pourront en cas de nécessité, exercer à terre le droit de réquisition dans les mêmes conditions que celles prévues par le règlement annexé à la Convention IV de La Haye 1907, ou toute autre convention qui viendrait à remplacer celle-ci et à laquelle chacune desdites Puissances serait partie. Toutefois, ces réquisitions ne pourront être effectuées que moyennant paiement immédiat.

7. La Grande-Bretagne, la France et l'Italie retireront leurs forces de Constantinople et de la partie de la zone démilitarisée qu'elles doivent évacuer après la ratification du traité.

Une commission sera constituée dans les quinze jours qui suivront la mise en vigueur du futur traité pour fixer sur place les limites de la partie continentale de la zone démilitarisée prévue ci-dessus. Cette commission sera composée de trois membres respectivement nommés par les autorités militaires de la France, de la Grande-Bretagne et de l'Italie, et, selon les cas, d'un membre nommé par le Gouvernement hellénique, ou de ce qui concerne la partie de la zone placée sous la souveraineté hellénique, ou d'un membre nommé par le Gouvernement ottoman, en ce qui concerne la partie de la zone restant sous la souveraineté ottomane. Les décisions de la commission, qui statuera à la majorité, seront exécutoires.

Les frais de cette commission seront imputés au compte des frais d'occupation de la zone.

6. Forces armées de la Turquie.

Quant aux forces armées de la Turquie, les Puissances ne voient pas la possibilité de maintenir le maintien de la conscription qui a été écartée dans tous les traités signés par la Turquie. Elles proposent à étudier dans un esprit amical la détermination de la période dans laquelle le système du recrutement volontaire devra être établi.

Les Puissances alliées recommanderont l'utilisation d'officiers armés pour l'organisation, le commandement et l'entretien de la gendarmerie, en indiquant que ces officiers seront au service de la Turquie selon les pratiques en usage avant 1914.

Après un examen approfondi fait par les experts militaires des chiffres qu'il est possible d'indiquer pour les effectifs de l'armée turque, les Puissances jugeront que ces effectifs pourront atteindre les chiffres suivants :

15.000 hommes pour la gendarmerie.

10.000 hommes pour l'armée.

25.000 hommes au total.

7. Dispositions financières.

Il n'est pas dans l'intention des trois Puissances de prévoir dans le Traité de Paix la suppression des décrets annexes, ainsi que tous les contrats énumérés à l'Annexe I des clauses financières du projet de Traité de Sévres sont maintenus.

Il est entendu que les dispositions financières du projet de Traité de Sévres sont maintenues.

Le principe de la contribution à la Dette publique ottomane des territoires occupés de l'Empire ottoman est maintenu.

Une Commission de Liquidation composée de représentants des trois Puissances alliées sera constituée pour examiner les réclamations des ressortissants alliés pour dommages causés par la guerre, ainsi que des réclamations des ressortissants alliés pour dommages causés par la guerre.

La Turquie s'engage à verser à cette Commission de Liquidation, pendant six années, les sommes nécessaires pour couvrir les dépenses de la Commission.

commission aura la faculté de ne réclamer à la Turquie qu'une somme de £T 3,000,000 or par an, étant entendu que la différence entre le montant total de l'annuité et cette annuité réduite sera répartie sur les années suivantes.

Pour assurer le paiement de cette annuité, le Gouvernement ottoman devra affecter, irrévocablement les excédents restant libres des revenus de la douane, de la

l'aghaïm, ainsi que la part du Gouvernement dans les concessions existantes ou à venir.

La Commission de Liquidation déterminera les moyens qu'elle jugera convenables pour assurer la gestion des revenus données en gage.

7 bis. Clauses financières

Projet d'Article relatif aux Concessions.

Le Gouvernement ottoman communiquera pour avis à la Commission financière, avant promulgation, les contrats des nouvelles concessions ou de prorogation de concessions existantes à accorder en faveur des ressortissants ottomans ou de tous autres.

Le Gouvernement ottoman devra en outre donner à la Commission de Liquidation et à ses représentants toutes les facilités nécessaires pour l'accomplissement de sa mission auprès des administrations intéressées.

b. Régime des Capitulations

Les Puissances alliées desent assurer à la Turquie toute l'indépendance économique compatible avec une protection convenable des intérêts de leurs nationaux.

Après l'entrée en vigueur du Traité de Paris, une commission composée de représentants de la Grande-Bretagne, de la France, de l'Italie et du Japon d'une part, et de la Turquie d'autre part, pour préparer, avec l'assistance d'experts techniques représentant les

capitulaires en matière fiscale.

Ces propositions stipuleront l'égalité fiscale entre les sujets étrangers et les sujets turcs, tout en protégeant les premiers contre des impositions excessives ou des abus dans le recouvrement, et toute modification des droits de douane qui serait reconnue nécessaire du consentement des Puissances intéressées.

En ce qui regarde les Capitulations en matière judiciaire, les Puissances alliées renouvellent leur offre primitive de réunir dans le même délai une commission semblable pour préparer un projet de réforme judiciaire destiné à remplacer le système capitulaire, qui continuera provisoirement à être appliqué en attendant la mise en vigueur du projet proposé. Cette commission, où la Turquie sera représentée, aura la faculté de recommander soit un système judiciaire mixte, soit un système judiciaire unifié.

B 4028 5. 44]

No. 87

Comte de Saint-Aulaire to Sir W. Tyrrell.

Ambassade de France, Londres,
le 7 avril 1922.

Cher Sir William,

SANS faire de l'évacuation immédiate de l'Anatolie par l'armée grecque la condition essentielle de la conclusion de l'armistice, comme le voudrait le Gouvernement

Anglais, nous sommes persuadés que la conclusion de l'armistice ne saurait être conditionnée par la durée de l'évacuation.

Aussi, si l'on veut que la conclusion de l'armistice ne soit pas conditionnée par la durée de l'évacuation, il faut que la conclusion de l'armistice ne soit pas conditionnée par la durée de l'évacuation.

Il est évident que la conclusion de l'armistice ne saurait être conditionnée par la durée de l'évacuation.

Veuillez agréer, Sir,

SAINT-AULAIRE.

Fussuf Kemal Pasha to French Government.

(Télégraphique.)

Angora, le 5 avril 1922

J'AI l'honneur de porter à votre haute connaissance que le Gouvernement de la grande Assemblée nationale de Turquie a examiné avec la plus grande attention les propositions relatives à la suspension immédiate des hostilités instantanément recommandées comme leur premier devoir par les Ministres des Affaires étrangères des trois grandes Puissances—la France, la Grande-Bretagne et l'Italie—réunies à Paris dans le but hautement humanitaire de rétablir la paix dans le Proche-Orient et de faire évacuer les territoires turcs sans nouvelles pertes de vies et de biens. Le Gouvernement de la grande Assemblée nationale de Turquie est reconnaissant aux Ministres des Affaires étrangères des trois grandes Puissances pour les efforts qu'ils ont déployés en vue de mettre fin à la guerre d'invasion que l'armée hellénique délaquée à Smyrne poursuit, comme il est connu du monde entier, en causant l'effusion du sang de musulmans sans nombre et des dévastations incalculables.

Le Gouvernement de la grande Assemblée nationale de Turquie accepte en principe l'armistice qui a été proposé, avec l'intention déclarée de faire évacuer les territoires turcs.

Cependant, il ne serait consentir à ce que l'armistice crée au profit de l'ennemi la possibilité de reprendre la guerre d'invasion blâmée par le monde entier, avec des forces fraîches, en imposant, d'une part, à la Turquie de nouveaux sacrifices et, d'autre part, à l'ennemi de nouvelles pertes. Les Puissances alliées ne sauraient ignorer que les raisons qui justifient cette attitude de mon Gouvernement ne sont pas défaut, en effet, le Gouvernement du Roi Constantin a répondu aux efforts faits à Londres par les trois grandes Puissances en mars 1921, dans le but de rétablir la paix, en redonnant à son armée une offensive sans succès. Le Roi Constantin a de

mandes Puissances réunies à Paris pendant le mois de juin de la même année, en débarquant à Smyrne avec des allures de conquérant et en déclenchant une autre offensive stérile qui a coûté tant de vies et de biens.

Devant ces précédents, mon Gouvernement estime comme condition fondamentale de l'armistice qu'il est indispensable de procéder à l'évacuation dès la conclusion de ce dernier. Or, les conditions d'armistice communiquées par la note du 23 mars dernier ne constituent une garantie ni pour l'évacuation, ni contre le renouvellement des hostilités. Par contre, en face de cette dernière éventualité, elles imposeraient à l'armée turque la nécessité de reprendre la défense légitime de la patrie dans des conditions défavorables qui résulteraient nécessairement d'un contrôle prolongé. D'autre part, nous sommes convaincus que les trois grandes Puissances desent également délivrer un moment plus tôt les musulmans des atrocités infligées par les armées grecques auxquelles ils sont en butte depuis trois ans, comme ceci est attesté par les enquêtes impartiales des commissions européennes et américaines, atrocités qui ont pris une grande extension et intensité depuis la dernière proposition d'armistice et qui se manifestent par des massacres en masse, par des destructions, incendies, pillages et viols horribles. Mon Gouvernement a la conviction que le fait de procéder à l'évacuation dès la conclusion de l'armistice concorde avec le point de vue des trois grandes Puissances, étant donné que la proposition d'armistice a été faite dans l'intention de rétablir la paix dans le Proche-Orient. Pour Mineure par les forces grecques et la restauration de la souveraineté turque sur l'ensemble de cette région.

Par conséquent, le Gouvernement de la grande Assemblée nationale de Turquie propose que la durée de l'armistice soit de quatre mois, qui est le délai fixé pour l'évacuation de l'Anatolie et consent à la prolongation automatique dudit armistice pour un durée supplémentaire de trois mois, au cas où les pourparlers préliminaires de paix ne seraient pas terminés. Quant à la procédure de l'évacuation, mon Gouvernement estime nécessaire que la ligne générale Eski-Cheir-Koutahia-Afoun-Karahissar soit évacuée dans les premiers quinze jours et tous les territoires occupés, y compris Smyrne, dans les quatre mois à partir du commencement de l'armistice.

Il est évident que la conclusion de l'armistice ne saurait être conditionnée par la durée de l'évacuation.

[8975]

et de prendre des mesures propres à assurer la sécurité des personnes et des biens qu'après un délai de quinze jours à partir de leur évacuation. Dans le cas où les points précédents, qui constituent, comme il sera sans doute apprécié dûment par l'opinion publique mondiale, une preuve nouvelle des intentions pacifiques de la grande Assemblée nationale de Turquie, seraient acceptés par les Puissances alliées, mon Gouvernement est prêt à envoyer dans les trois semaines ses délégués dans une ville à déterminer en vue de procéder à l'examen des propositions de paix des trois grandes Puissances. — YORSEUR KEMAL.

E 3776 5 44]

No. 86

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received April 10.)

(No. 326. Confidential)

My Lord,

Constantinople, April 3, 1922.

I TOOK the opportunity of the visit which I paid to the Grand Vizier on the 1st April to enquire how the Turkish Government viewed the settlement which had been proposed by the Allied Foreign Ministers.

The Grand Vizier replied that, whilst a very great step had been made towards the restoration of peace, the decision that the Greeks were to retain Adrianople gravely impaired the value of the proposed settlement in Turkish eyes. I pointed out that one of the points on which both the Central Government and the Nationalists had laid greatest stress was that the presence of the Greeks on the northern shore of the Sea of Marmora constituted a permanent menace to the safety of Constantinople. It was now proposed to remove this menace, for not only was Rodosto to be handed back to Turkey, but Eastern Thrace on both sides of the proposed frontier was to be demilitarised, whilst the Gallipoli Peninsula was to be occupied by Allied troops.

The Grand Vizier admitted that the proposed demilitarisation of Eastern Thrace would undoubtedly help matters, though it would, on the other hand, make it more difficult for the Turks to cope with komitaji bands which were sure to form on the Greek side of the frontier. He dwelt at length on the danger to peace which the formation of these bands would constitute. I told him I thought he was exaggerating this danger.

As there is good reason to suppose that both the Central and the Angora Government are anxious to secure the course of which further concessions of a territorial nature may possibly be obtained, I pointed out that the present proposals, moreover, these proposals had been made unanimously by the three Powers, and must be looked on as a whole. There were two parties to the settlement, the Greeks and the Turks. I reminded his Highness that the war in Anatolia had reached a deadlock, the only issue from which was a reasonable compromise. I did not believe that the Nationalist army could drive the Greeks out of Asia Minor any more than that the Greek army could achieve victory over Nationalist forces. I asked the Grand Vizier to represent the above considerations to his colleagues when the Cabinet met to examine the proposed settlement.

It is essential that neither the French nor the Italian High Commissioner should show any weakening in their language in the sense of allowing the Turks to suppose that they can secure any further territorial concessions. In this connection, I learnt from a good secret source that, at a meeting of the Association of the Turkish Press on the 29th March, the editor of the "Vakit" informed his friends, in confidence, of a personal communication made on the previous day to himself and to the editor of the "Tefhid Efkar" by the Counsellor of the French Embassy. According to this statement the two editors had been invited to the French Embassy, where they were received by Count Chambrun, who spoke to the following effect:—

"The interests of Turkey oblige you to appear favourable to the general principles of the proposed settlement. Nevertheless, we must insist that the Straits must remain Turkish. According to my personal impres-

sion, if the Turks can insist in the right way ('savent bien insister') a few months longer they will obtain Adrianople also. The army will remain intact and will always be what it is, for I know that there is now a very strong current in favour of the Turks."

Allowance must be made for Turkish inaccuracy or exaggeration in repeating what they have heard. I am, however, very anxious that the Turks should accept the proposed settlement and agree to come to a conference. I had a conversation on the 1st April, made no secret of his hope that the Turks would accept the proposed settlement. He thought that they had nothing to gain by being recalcitrant, and that the unfavourable comments in the Turkish press must be discounted.

It is conceivable, therefore, that in order to get the Turks to come to the proposed conference the French may be holding out to them the possibility of obtaining further concessions.

It is probable, in my opinion, that the Central Government will await some indication from Angora before it gives its views on the proposed settlement and conference. The Turks, both here and at Angora, will naturally be largely guided by events at Athens. Meanwhile, the Soviet agent at Angora is pretty sure to work hard to prevent the Angora Government from accepting either the armistice proposal or the peace settlement.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,

High Commissioner

E 3785 5 44]

No. 89

M. de Montille to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received April 10.)

Ambassade de France, Londres,

le 10 avril 1922.

M. le Marquis,

LE Gouvernement français vient de recevoir la réponse du Gouvernement de Constantinople aux propositions qui lui ont été adressées au nom des Gouvernements britannique, français et italien après la réunion de leurs Ministres des Affaires étrangères, qui s'est tenue à Paris du 22 au 26 mars dernier.

Il honneur de faire parvenir ci-joint, à toutes fins utiles, à votre Seigneurie le texte de la communication ottomane telle qu'elle a été transmise à mon Gouvernement par le Haut-Commissaire français à Constantinople.

Veuillez agréer, &c.

L. DE MONTILLE.

Enclosure in No. 89

Izzet Pasha to French High Commissioner, Constantinople.

M. le Président,

J'ai l'honneur de recevoir la communication que votre Excellence a bien voulu m'adresser, et je tiens à remercier votre Excellence pour l'attention que vous avez bien voulu lui porter. Je tiens également à remercier les Excellences MM. les Ministres des Affaires étrangères de la Grande-Bretagne et d'Italie pour me transmettre l'exposé des propositions.

Je m'empresse de faire savoir à votre Excellence que la Sublime-Porte apprécie hautement les dispositions bienveillantes témoignées par votre Excellence et ses collègues en faveur du rétablissement de la paix et lui exprime sa vive gratitude.

Je tiens également à dire que la Sublime-Porte est convaincue que la paix régnera à nouveau dans le monde et que la Turquie sera en mesure de contribuer à la réalisation de cette paix.

Je tiens également à dire que la Sublime-Porte est convaincue que la Turquie sera en mesure de contribuer à la réalisation de cette paix.

Je tiens également à dire que la Sublime-Porte est convaincue que la Turquie sera en mesure de contribuer à la réalisation de cette paix.

[6975]

2 m 2

Sublime-Porte ne saurait trop insister sur l'opportunité d'assurer l'évacuation avec le plus de célérité possible tant pour les réfugiés que pour la paix et la tranquillité dont elles sont privées depuis trois ans que pour faire cesser les indolentes atrocités et persécutions que la population ne cesse d'endurer. Le Gouvernement impérial aurait été très heureux que la conférence pût se réunir à Constantinople ou dans une autre ville de Turquie, mais je regrette que des raisons d'ordre local m'obligent de prier les trois Puissances alliées de vouloir bien désigner à cet effet une ville dans l'Europe occidentale. Le Gouvernement impérial, dont le seul objectif est d'assurer l'intégrité et la sécurité future de la Turquie, son indépendance politique et économique ainsi que le rétablissement d'une paix juste et durable dans le Proche-Orient, est persuadé que les considérations qu'il aura l'honneur toujours dans un esprit de conciliation (sic) d'exposer à cet effet de la prochaine conférence seront examinées dans un large esprit de justice et d'équité et que satisfaction sera donnée à ses droits.

E 3786 5/44

No. 90.

V. de Montille to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received April 10.)

*Ambassade de France, Londres,
le 10 avril 1922*

M. le Marquis,

AUSSITÔT après avoir reçu le mémorandum de votre Excellence en date du 7 de ce mois, le Comte de Saint-Aulaire a fait savoir à M. Poincaré que le Gouvernement britannique partageait la manière de voir du Gouvernement français sur la réponse à faire aux questions posées par le représentant d'Angora à Constantinople au sujet de la conclusion de l'armistice gréco-turc.

M. Poincaré a répondu à l'Ambassadeur de France en le priant de soumettre à l'agrément de votre Seigneurie le projet de réponse ci-joint que le Gouvernement français, le Gouvernement britannique et le Gouvernement d'Angora par l'entremise des Hauts-Commissaires, se sont accordés à Constantinople.

Ce projet de réponse a également été soumis à la Consulta, et je serais très heureux de bien vouloir me mettre à même de faire savoir aussi rapidement que possible à M. Poincaré si le texte ci-joint est approuvé par le Gouvernement britannique.

Veuillez agréer, &c.
LE DE MONTILLE

Enclosure in No. 90

Projet de Texte à remettre au Gouvernement d'Angora.

Les Gouvernements de France, de Grande-Bretagne et d'Italie ont l'honneur d'accuser réception au Gouvernement d'Angora de la réponse en date du 5 avril 1922 faite par lui aux propositions de paix établies par les Puissances alliées en vue du rétablissement de la paix en Orient.

Ils sont heureux de prendre acte de l'adhésion de votre Gouvernement d'Angora en ce qui concerne l'armistice ainsi que des conditions d'évacuation et de la reprise des territoires occupés, et de vous en féliciter. Ils ont délégué dans une ville à déterminer en vue de procéder à l'exécution des clauses de paix.

Toutefois, les Puissances alliées ne croient pas pouvoir accepter immédiatement l'Anatolie, dont le Gouvernement d'Angora voudrait faire dépendre la conclusion de l'armistice. Le Gouvernement grec refusant en effet de soumettre, avant le début des négociations, à une condition de cette sorte, ou s'il acceptait, il serait en mesure de modifier les conditions de l'armistice.

Les Puissances alliées ont donc décidé de proposer au Gouvernement d'Angora de suspendre l'armistice jusqu'à ce que le Gouvernement grec ait accepté les conditions de l'armistice. Elles ont également décidé de proposer au Gouvernement d'Angora de suspendre l'armistice jusqu'à ce que le Gouvernement grec ait accepté les conditions de l'armistice.

trouve renouvelable automatiquement jusqu'à ce que les deux belligérents aient accepté les préliminaires de paix.

Les Puissances alliées estiment avoir donné satisfaction dans une importante mesure à la demande principale du Gouvernement d'Angora, souhaitant vivement qu'il accepte la suspension d'armes dans les conditions ci-dessus indiquées. Elles le prient de lui faire connaître les noms de ses représentants et se réservant d'indiquer ensuite la ville qui sera proposée pour l'établissement des conditions des préliminaires de paix.

Paris, le 9 avril 1922

E 3632 5/44]

No. 91

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Count de Saint-Aulaire.

Your Excellency,

Foreign Office, April 10, 1922

IN reply to your note of the 4th April, I have the honour to inform your Excellency that I have had the various texts agreed upon by the three Ministers for Foreign Affairs in the recent conference in Paris, as enclosed in your note, carefully examined, and that His Majesty's Government accept them, subject to the observations which follow. In order to make these observations clearer, I am transmitting herewith, for the confidential information of the French Government, two copies of the British records of the ten meetings of the Foreign Ministers.

Minorities.—In the eighteenth line it was agreed to substitute "des Gouvernements de la Grèce et de la Turquie" for "les deux Gouvernements intéressés," see p. 3 of the records of the third meeting. This point is merely one of drafting.

3. Thrace.—I would draw your attention to p. 2 of the records of the ninth meeting, in which it was agreed that the frontier of the Turkish and Greek States in the Thracian peninsula should be determined by the Allied Governments in accordance with Marshal Foch's instructions, it was decided to substitute a general description given in the Allied note to the Greek and Turkish Governments (see the penultimate paragraph of p. 8 of the record and annexes of the ninth meeting). In these circumstances I cannot see my way now to accept the description of the line suggested as "un point à choisir à l'est de Ganos," or the mention of the valley of the Ana Su, and I would suggest that the text of the above-mentioned paragraph of the Allied note should be adopted in their place. The passage in question would then run:

Elle partira d'un point à choisir dans le voisinage de Ganos sur la mer de Marmara, et sera tracée dans une direction nord et nord-est pour aboutir à la frontière bulgare dans le massif occidental des monts Strandja, limitant en territoire grec les villages de Baba-Eski et de Kirk-Kilisse et en territoire turc la ville de Rodosto. Une zone . . .

With regard to the second paragraph of the proposed text for Thrace, I would

draw your attention to the fact that in the records of the ninth meeting (see p. 2 of the records of that meeting), greater precision should be given to the economic facilities to be accorded by Turkey at Rodosto. I would propose that the following paragraph should be substituted:—

"The Turkish Government will give to the trade of that part of Eastern Thrace which remains Greek every facility at the port of Rodosto and over the roads and railways built or to be built to that port."

In the last paragraph of the proposed text for Thrace the word "suspension" should be substituted for "cessation," as was decided at the seventh meeting of the foreign Ministers (see p. 2 of the record of that meeting).

4. Demilitarized zone.—Paragraph 4 of the proposed French text is enclosed in your note, should read:

après le mise en vigueur du traité," in accordance with the discussion and decision of the conference recorded on p. 5 of the record of the seventh meeting of the three Foreign Ministers.

Financial clauses.—In the course of the discussion at the sixth meeting, attention was drawn by M. Poincaré to the question of the currency in which the indemnity should be expressed, but no resolution of the conference was taken as to modifying the currency recommended by the financial advisers, namely pounds sterling. In these circumstances His Majesty's Government could not now agree to Turkish gold pounds being substituted for pounds sterling without further discussion, as, among other things, such a change would mean a reduction in the amount of the indemnity fixed. His Majesty's Government would, therefore, ask that the text recommended by the financial advisers should be left as adopted by the conference on the clear understanding that when the final treaty comes to be drafted, His Majesty's Government would agree to the actual currency of the indemnity being expressed in such a way as to avoid the difficulties regarding the fluctuation of exchange to which your note rightly draws attention and taking into account the corresponding provisions

law, according to the British notes, read: "Le Gouvernement ottoman devra demander son de Liquidation, avant promulgation, sur les contrats . . .". In the second paragraph the words "son représentant" should be substituted for the words "ses représentants."

7. **Armed Forces of Turkey.**—While it was agreed at the eighth meeting (see p. 3 of the record) that no mention should be made in any communication to the Turks of the principle of equal division among the Allies of the Allied officers in the Turkish gendarmerie, His Majesty's Government presume that it is clearly understood that the principle of such division will be binding upon the Allies, even in the event of the Turkish Government seeking to give one ally a monopoly of the provision of such officers, and they would be glad to receive an assurance on this point.

8. Subject to these observations, which I trust M. Poincaré will readily see his way to accept in the light of the explanations and assurances which I have given, I agree to the texts proposed. I presume that the French Government will now communicate the texts, with the modifications suggested above, to the Italian Government. As soon as the latter also have accepted them, I would suggest that identical instructions might be sent to the representatives of the three Allied Governments at Athens and Constantinople to communicate the agreed texts to the Greek and Constantinople and Angora Governments respectively as soon as the three Allied Governments are in agreement that the Greek Government and the two Turkish Governments have accepted the Allied armistice proposals and are prepared to attend the suggested conference.

I have, &c.
CURZON OF KEDLESTON

[E 4083 & 44]

No. 92

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received April 18.)

(No. 352. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Will refer to the telegram N. 280 of the 15th inst. which I have just received from you. I am sorry to hear that you were not able to see the Sultan on the 14th inst. I am sure that you will have felt that this rule imposed by His Majesty's Government was a great disadvantage. On this occasion, therefore, I intended to arrange independently to see the Sultan and simply to inform my colleagues that I was doing so. It so happens that the French High Commissioner was apparently of the same mind, for after speaking to the Sultan yesterday, he has just arranged to see the Sultan to-day.

was actually received by the Sultan on the 3rd April. Thus, by a fortunate coincidence, it is the French High Commissioner and not myself who has taken the lead in abandoning the rule mentioned above.

2. The Sultan kept me for close upon two and a-half hours, and was, as usual, very cordial. He followed his usual practice of seeing me alone with Mr. Ryan, who acted as interpreter.

3. The Sultan has recently had a slight indisposition, and he was still suffering from neuralgia. He appears to be otherwise in fairly good health. He is fuller in the face than when I last saw him, and presents a more Turkish appearance. This was emphasised by his occasional gestures when appealing for British support. At moments he almost resembled a worthy Oriental presenting a petition, though he bore himself with his usual dignity.

4. In the course of the preliminary courtesies, His Majesty referred to the desire to see me which he had expressed through Prince Samy Bey in January. He had been anxious, he said, to put forward certain personal considerations before the Allied Foreign Ministers met in Paris, and regretted that he had been denied the opportunity of doing so. It was not, however, absolutely essential, else he might have been more insistent. The object he then had in view would be partly attained by the present interview. Indeed, if I had not myself asked for an audience he would have himself renewed his request that I should visit him.

5. I had already told His Majesty that I had sought an interview because it seemed appropriate to do so in view of the new development in the Eastern question following on the Paris Conference. I now added that I had not lost sight of the invitation which he had addressed to me through Prince Samy Bey, and that I was seizing the first opportunity which had presented itself since that request was made. I said it would be very useful to have a direct statement of His Majesty's personal views.

6. The Sultan said he would speak to me with a frankness which he reserved for his interviews with the representative of Great Britain. He claimed that the event had invariably proved the correctness of what he had said in previous interviews, e.g., with Admiral de Robeck, even when he had said things which at the time excited

at nothing and had got everything. He said that he was to transfer their authority to Constantinople.

7. His Majesty agreed that the Eastern question had entered on a new phase. His own object, he said, was to end the present devastation. The question in Turkey, however, was not merely one of foreign affairs, but was an internal one. There were two factors, the legitimate Government of Constantinople, of which he was the chief, and the revolutionary organisation at Angora. He and his Government were in the position of having to choose between the legitimate Government or with the revolutionary organisation?

8. I said that the Allies appreciated the difficulties of the Central Government, but that they themselves were also in a difficult position. They were confronted by a dual system in Turkey. Their hope was that a peace settlement, which would include the evacuation of Asia Minor, would deprive Angora of its *raison d'être*, and that the Allies would find themselves face to face with a single Turkish Government, which would naturally be that of His Majesty. As a proof that we did not doubt the legitimate status of the Constantinople Government I pointed out that the Allied High Commissioners had personally handed the recent peace proposals to the Grand Vizier, and that any suggestion of their handing them in the same way to the Angora agent had been dismissed.

9. The Sultan said he appreciated the value of the distinction which had been made. He insisted, however, that the difficulty of which he had spoken would arise in the course of the settlement to be effected. He and his Government were placed in a false position. They might, for instance, be prepared to make peace on terms which Angora would not accept. He said that he was not prepared to make peace on terms which Angora would not accept, and that he was not prepared to make peace on terms which Angora would not accept.

ment as traitors. They were, indeed, already doing this, though without justification. He was indifferent to such charges so long as they were false, but he could not subscribe to peace terms the acceptance of which would appear to justify the accusation. He spoke also of the legal difficulty. His Government could agree to terms for which they were prepared to accept responsibility, but no terms could legally be ratified without the consent of the representatives of the people assembled in Parliament. It was impossible in present circumstances to convene a Parliament. The Angora Assembly was an unlawful body. Would Great Britain, he asked, lend her help to relieve this impossible internal situation? He would go on to tell me his own proposals. Before offering observations I said I should prefer to hear the Sultan's proposals, but in my turn I asked a question. If the lawful Government accepted the terms recently drawn up by the Allies in a spirit of great impartiality, would the not be able to attach to them the 10 per cent. of the population who, His Majesty said, were at least opposed to the Kemalists?

10. The Sultan said that any question went to the root of the matter. The settlement must be one which Constantinople could offer to the country as satisfying the requirements of the Islamic world and of Turkey. He had a double position as Caliph

role in Islam was that of a great moral authority, not that of a revolutionary focus. As Caliph he must satisfy the Islamic world. As Sultan he could not sacrifice a portion of his people, who were blood brothers of the rest. His Majesty who had made it increasingly evident that he was leading up to the question of Thrace, then outlined what he said was the only possible basis of a settlement. Turkey must have the Maritima frontier. He would be prepared to see a neutral zone of any extent established round the Straits, and to see it safeguarded, if necessary, by the presence of the Allied troops. Western Thrace should be given a special administration of its own. The cardinal point was that the Greeks must not be established in proximity to Constantinople. At this point the Sultan referred to a very confidential message which he had sent me some time ago through Tewfik Pasha, and of which your Lordship is cognizant. He did not dwell on this, beyond saying that he was prepared for any private arrangement with Great Britain which His Majesty's Government would like either after or before the conclusion of peace.

11. I did not directly answer the Sultan's question. I offered secured three great objects, namely, the security of the Straits, the protection of the Turkish homeland, and the protection of the Turkish people. The proposed frontier line in Thrace had been drawn up by the best generals in the world who had been expressly asked to devise a scheme such as would render Constantinople immune from attack.

12. While this was being translated the Sultan interrupted several times. He said that Adrianople was no less a Turkish homeland than the Smyrna area, as 75 per cent. of the population were Moslem and Turkish. He supplemented this later by saying that Adrianople had acquired a quality of sacredness in the eyes of the Moslems. As regards the Caliphate, he expressed gratitude for what had been done. When my observations had been translated in full, he replied more generally. He said my statement represented one point of view, but the view he himself was about to express was that of all Moslems and Turks. The settlement proposed was unnatural, and would produce no peace, but a protracted and unstable armistice. Constantinople would not be safe. The Turks there would live in constant apprehension of attack and would not be able to devote themselves to the necessary task of reorganisation. I had

had been told by the directions given to them. He doubted whether they had been believed in their hearts that the Turks could hold their own.

The Powers, especially Great Britain, must be prepared to make concessions, which would mean little to them but were vital to Turkey. He appealed to His Majesty's Government to show the same liberality to Turkey as they had shown to Egypt. They had given Egypt her independence subject to safeguards for the waterway of the Canal. Could they not give Turkey independence, subject to safeguards such as he had proposed for the freedom of the Straits? He developed at length the view that he could not abandon a portion of his country the bulk of the

over part of one's household to the custody of strangers. There could be no safety, he went on to say, in the Balkans if the Greeks remained in Thrace, even in Western Thrace. Bulgaria would come down upon them, and his own subjects

would be drawn into adventures with the Bulgarians. The Balkans were full of unruly races. The divisions between them were not divisions of religion. Tarsus had invented the fiction that they were, but they were really divisions of race.

authority to whom the Central Government, not the A. Thrace should first be evacuated so that the Central Government could extend its authority over Asia Minor. Similarly the evacuation should not be carried out in such a manner as to enable the Kemalists to take delivery of the territory as it was evacuated. In this connection he made a passing reference to the question of financial assistance to enable his programme to be carried out.

14. The Sultan now showed signs of fatigue. He said he knew pretty well what answer I should have to return, as I had to defend the view of my Government. His object in bringing me to the Palace was not so much to hear my observations as to explain his own view and to beg me to lay them before the highest authorities. He was speaking not as a diplomat, but with a sincerity born of convictions of the soundness of which he was certain. He spoke as the head of a family and as a spiritual chief. He was not using the language of exaggeration. He spoke in fact like a Turk and not like a Persian, he added humorously.

15. I said I would certainly lay what His Majesty had said before His Majesty's Government, but I begged permission to offer observations on four points before taking leave of him. Firstly, I said the Foreign Ministers had expressly said that they did

the Greeks both of Thrace and Smyrna. Secondly, I thought it most unlikely that the Powers, after devoting so much trouble to a settlement in the Balkans, would readily allow that settlement to be upset in the future. Thirdly, I could not accept the parallel which His Majesty had drawn between Egypt and Turkey. Great Britain had voluntarily given up the protectorate which she had exercised over Egypt. Moreover, the latter country was not engaged in a war with another country. Fourthly, I observed that the further conference proposed by the three Powers would provide an opportunity for discussing points of detail, though I was careful to add that they did not contemplate any radical change in their recent proposals and referred His Majesty to your Lordship's speech in the House of Lords on the 30th March.

16. The Sultan once more interrupted frequently while these remarks were being translated. He said the Turks and the Greeks were not in the same position. Turkey was asking for something vital. Greece had no essential interest at stake. If their respective positions were compared it would be seen that Turkey had lost two-thirds of her territory. Greece had gained in the same proportion. Referring to my second point, he said that no Turk had confidence in guarantees for the stability of any settlement in the Balkans. He was expressing not his own belief, but that of the generality of Turks. They had seen too many guarantees disregarded in the past to have confidence in them now. On my fourth point His Majesty made the somewhat

a modification of detail, as

17. I have endeavoured in the foregoing paragraphs to give the main lines of a conversation with the Sultan. It is not easy to reproduce it with complete accuracy or in exact order owing to His Majesty's habit of making long speeches, reiterating his points and interrupting the translation as new points occurred to him. To complete my account of what passed it is necessary to summarise certain points made here and there in the course of the conversation. He referred over and over again to the difficulty of his personal position. In speaking a second time of his desire to come to some separate agreement with His Majesty's Government, he said he was prepared for anything, but he had no standing ground. He cited the saying of Archimedes and said that he was a leaver without a fulcrum. He referred more than once to the

which was being brought to bear on him by the Moslem world generally to Turkish rights. As I was taking leave he returned to this point and begged me to excuse him if he presented the appearance of being hard pressed. It was because he was under three responsibilities, namely, to Islam, to his country and to his

18. The Sultan's language about the Angora Government was no better in over-

He referred to previous conversations with Atinal Is Hobeek and myself in which he had defined his attitude towards Angora, and he said it was unalterable. At the same time he showed sensitiveness to the criticism which Angora might level at him. His person, he said, was at stake. It was one of the conditions of tenure of the Embassy that the incumbent of that office should be approved of by Moslems only. It might be that his position would be made impossible if he could not command the confidence of the Moslems. It was a small matter so far as he as an individual was concerned, but he was concerned for the position which he had to uphold.

The Sultan referred at least twice to the connection of the Komagists with the Turkish Government. He spoke of their perfect readiness to go on fighting, and said that unless terms could be offered which would put the ground firm under their feet, they would maintain the dual system in Turkey and might easily drift from dualism into separatism. At one moment when His Majesty spoke of this determination of the Komagists to go on fighting, I seized the opportunity of saying that there was much too great a tendency among the nationalist Turks to regard the Greeks as being at the end of their resources. This, I said, was far from being the case. If the Komagists were convinced that they were going to win, they would not have been so eager to go on fighting.

Our own way even in the Smyrna area, and the Greeks had a very strong position there. The Sultan said he quite appreciated this. His point was that the Komagists were the best of the allies, but that they would keep on fighting, only too eager to do so in order not to lose their trade and there would be no settlement.

20. The Sultan was hardly in his best form at this interview. I came away from it with a feeling of disappointment at finding how little he had been impressed by the outcome of the Paris Conference. In one sense he showed little inclination to face the realities of the situation, as, for instance, in his apparent failure to understand how strongly the Majesty's Government feel about the Gallipoli Peninsula, and how useless it is to persist in the idea of separate arrangements with His Majesty's Government behind the back of the Allies. Nevertheless, he is faced with one great reality which he fully appreciates. It is that Angora, which means his personal position no less than it delays the conclusion of peace in the East, has gone from success to success, and has obtained increasing recognition, and that the Allies, even now that they have agreed on a programme, show no disposition to enforce its acceptance. Like Ismet Pasha in London, he cannot afford to be less patriotic than the Angora leaders, so long as the Angora leaders can hold out to Turkey the hope of securing an accord at all the less when he received from British subjects in Asia, more Turkish than British, a message from him to stick out for the whole of France, for the whole of the world, and even for a way in the affairs of Arabia generally. In view of the position, I have ventured to urge in my despatch that the Allies should not be misled by the propaganda of the Angora leaders.

21. The duty of making a statement of the situation is impossible. He remains the natural centre round which reasonable Turks can rally, and when they are given solid reason to believe that the game of the extremists is lost, they will turn to him.

I have, &c.
HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner

E 4064 5 44]

No. 93

See H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston -- (Received April 18.)

Constantinople April 10, 1922

ON the 6th April Hamid Bey handed me the reply of the Angora Government to the note which the three High Commissioners had addressed to that Government on the 23rd ultimo, proposing an armistice. Hamid Bey, who stated that he had only arrived from France that morning, said that he was the bearer of good tidings.

2. I asked him to allow me to go through the note with him, and I took the opportunity to explain to him the proposals made by the three Allied Ministers for Foreign Affairs. I explained that the Angora Government seemed to be under a misapprehension both

with regard to the armistice and to the conditions for the evacuation of Asia Minor. The Greek Government had accepted the armistice proposal as it stood, and, by the terms of the armistice, would be precluded from bringing up fresh forces with which to attack the Turks. Hamid Bey replied that by the expression "fresh forces" the Nationalists meant that the armistice would allow the Greek troops a much needed rest. I said that they had been resting all the winter as there had been no fighting to speak of. Hamid Bey said that the Nationalists knew perfectly well that the Greek army was in a bad case badly fed and sheltered. I told him that our reports did not corroborate this statement, and that, on the contrary, the Greek army was in good billets.

3. I asked Hamid Bey what he thought of the proposed settlement which the three Allied Ministers had worked out at Paris. He replied that finance was his speciality, and that he could only talk about the financial provisions of the proposed settlement. I explained to him the financial control of Turkey, and he explained what he meant by alluding to the stipulation by which foreigners were not to pay excessive taxes. The inference was that, supposing that a tax was imposed on Turks and foreigners and it was contended that the tax was excessive, the Turkish Government would be precluded from taxing its own subjects, for the Allied proposals provided for equality between foreigners and Turks in the matter of taxation. I told him that his illustration was a grotesque exaggeration, but I subsequently ascertained that he had spoken to my colleagues in the same sense.

4. Speaking generally, I pointed out to Hamid Bey that, even judged by the terms of the national pact, the proposed settlement went a very long way to meeting the Nationalists. There were two parties to the conflict and it was not possible to give everything to one, taking everything away from the other.

I believe that the Angora Government is probably genuinely apprehensive as to the result of an armistice on its army. It has to face the possibility of desertion on a considerable scale. In case of necessity it would be difficult to lay hands on the arms. On the other hand, an acceptance of the proposal for the withdrawal of Greek forces would place the Nationalists in such a predominant position that there would be no limit to their pretensions.

5. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister at Athens.

I have, &c.
HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner

E 4065 5 44

No. 94

(No. 354.)

My Lord,

Constantinople April 10

THE Minister for Foreign Affairs called on me on the 8th instant in order to communicate to me the reply of the Constantinople Government both to the armistice proposal and to the solution worked out by the three Ministers for Foreign Affairs at Paris.

2. I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship this reply in original. A copy was forwarded to your Lordship by post on the 9th instant.

3. Your Lordship will observe that, as regards the armistice proposal, the Central Government merely says that you are already acquainted with the point of view of the army in this connection. By the use of the expression "the army," the Constantinople Government, of course, refers to the Angora Government.

4. The Constantinople Government dwells on the necessity for bringing about as soon as possible the evacuation of Asia Minor. I took this opportunity of explaining, to the best of my ability, to Ismet Pasha the reasons for which the evacuation of Asia Minor is impossible. I explained to him the reasons for which the evacuation of Asia Minor is impossible in the sense of the second paragraph of the proposed French reply to Angora (see your Lordship's despatch of the 23rd ultimo). I explained to him that the Greek Government had accepted the armistice proposal as made to it, and that article 3 of the armistice precluded the withdrawal of constituted units from the front. The fears of the Turkish Government with regard to a possible transfer of Greek forces from Asia Minor to Thrace were therefore unfounded.

5. The Minister for Foreign Affairs explained that the Constantinople Government saw considerable objection to Constantinople as the meeting place of the proposed conference. That Government thought that if the conference were held here it would give rise to a great deal of mischievous and undesirable propaganda, besides which he knew that the Nationalists were greatly opposed to holding the conference in this town. It appears that the Nationalist agent has in fact informed one of my the Nationalists could not consent to the conference taking place at Constantinople. As there is no other town in Turkey offering the smallest facilities for a conference, both the Constantinople and Angora Governments contemplate a town in Western Europe.

6. Izet Pasha stated that the Nationalists were obsessed by two ideas, fear of a Greek attack and the conviction that the Greek army is in a bad way. It was true that these two ideas are self-contradictory, but such was the case, and Izet Pasha suggested that the three Allied Powers should take this point of view into account in framing their reply to the Angora note of the 5th April. I should mention that this conversation took place before the receipt of your Lordship's telegram No. 160, as the proposed reply of the French Government to Angora.

Your Lordship will no doubt already have gathered that the Constantinople Government delayed its reply to the armistice and peace proposals until it was cognisant of the answer from Angora.

7. I am forwarding a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister at Athens.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD

High Commissioner

Each in No. 1

Izet Pasha to Sir H. Rumbold.

M. le Secrétaire d'Etat,

Soukima Porte, le 8 avril 1922.

J'ai eu l'honneur de recevoir la communication que votre Excellence a bien voulu m'adresser conjointement avec leurs Excellences MM. les Ministres des Affaires étrangères de France et d'Italie pour me transmettre l'exposé des propositions qu'ils ont adressées à Paris.

Je m'empresse de faire savoir à votre Excellence que la Sublime Porte approuve hautement les dispositions bienveillantes témoignées par votre Excellence et ses collègues en faveur du rétablissement de la paix et lui en exprime sa vive gratitude.

Animée également d'un ardent désir de voir l'ordre et la paix régner à nouveau dans le Proche-Orient, elle est prête à envoyer dans le délai de trois semaines une réponse à votre Excellence.

En attendant, votre Excellence a dû déjà prendre connaissance du

lequel nous ne nous

sans doute l'un

bien désigner à cet

le seul objectif est d'assurer l'intégrité et la stabilité politique et économique ainsi que le bien-être dans le Proche-Orient, est persuadé que les considérations qu'il aura l'honneur, toujours dans un esprit de conservation, d'exposer à cet effet à la prochaine conférence seront examinées dans un large esprit de justice et d'équité, et que satisfaction sera donnée à ses droits légitimes.

Ag. 602, &c.

A. IZZET

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received April 18.)

(No. 357. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, April 11, 1922.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 352 of the 10th instant relative to my conversation with the Sultan on the 6th April, I have the honour to transmit herewith a memorandum by Mr. Ryan recounting a conversation with a member of the Sultan's entourage, who from time to time serves as a private channel of communication between His Majesty and this High Commissioner. This gentleman's visit afforded an opportunity for further impressing on the Sultan considerations which owing to his fatigue he prevented me from developing fully at the actual interview, though I had of course not failed to draw his attention to them in the course of my own conversation.

HORACE RUMBOLD

High Commissioner

Memorandum by Mr. Ryan

I HAD a long visit yesterday from the Sultan's messenger, primarily to welcome me on my return and to ask my assistance in a point, but he said that the Sultan was aware of his visit, and he spoke a good deal about the had passed between your Excellency and the Sultan on the 6th April. He said that the Sultan was much preoccupied with the importance of arranging matters so that occupied territory to be evacuated should be handed over to the Central Government, as otherwise the Kemalists would obtain an enormous accession of influence, that he was also very anxious about Thrace and Adrianople, and that he was greatly concerned for his personal position, if the Kemalists ruled the roost in Turkey.

I said that, in fulfilment of your Excellency's promise to the Sultan, you had informed His Majesty's Government of his views by telegraph, and were reporting very fully by despatch. I took the opportunity of rehearsing in the following point.

I said there was one consideration which your Excellency had mentioned to the Sultan, but had not been able to develop at length as it came up late in the audience. It was this. The Kemalists were boasting very loud of their ability to finish with the Greeks in Asia Minor, if the war continued. Our own information did not lend us to suppose that the Greeks were at the last gasp, and our conviction was unaltered that, if active hostilities were resumed this year, the broad result would be the same as last year. The Greeks would neither overrun Anatolia, nor be thrown into the sea, and

warlike operation, what would be the result if the Greeks were strong in Thrace. I said that, if the Greeks were strong in Thrace, no one could object to their settlement, no one could object to their settlement, they would thereby strengthen their position in regard to Thrace would be worse than the present situation.

settlement proceeded. They were sincerely anxious to give neither side an advantage. I drew particular attention to one article in their armistice proposal, that which said that bodies of troops should not be moved. One object of this was to prevent the Greeks from transferring forces to Thrace, as they might be tempted to do, knowing that in the settlement they must in any case leave Asia Minor. The answer from Ankara aimed at getting a promise that the whole of Asia Minor would be evacuated in four months, whatever happened, and at securing a much stronger military position than they had now within a fortnight, i.e., before coming into conference with the three Powers and the Greeks. I said that this was not a matter which affected the Greeks only. So far as Great Britain was concerned, the Kemalists claimed to be in a state of armistice, not in a state of armistice. We had to consider a temporary position in Constantinople and a permanent position in Iraq. Where should we be under the

At the end of the peace negotiations after that period had

that the Sultan was really in a middle position. If the Ankara was very of the re a strengthened position, but of Ankara would be very much weaker.

I I impressed on the messenger that the Allies had formulated their desire without any arrière pensée. They sincerely wished for a general settlement on the basis of their proposals. If their plan for a settlement broke down, the considerations I had mentioned were of very great importance for Turkey.

In the course of general remarks on the Sultan's position and His Majesty's attitude, I once more emphasised the fact that, while His Majesty's Government had been unable for a long time to ignore Ankara, they could bring no regard to Constantinople as the seat of legitimate authority.

The Sultan's messenger listened carefully. Before leaving, he said that, if there was one thing of which the Sultan was absolutely convinced and in which he remained unshaken it was to Great Britain and Great Britain alone that Turkey must look for salvation.

Constantinople, April 10, 1922

E 4257 6 44

No. 96

Mr. Lindley to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received April 24.)

No. 182.)

My Lord,

Athens, April 9, 1922

I HAVE the honour to report, with reference to my telegram No. 110 of the 25th ultimo and later telegrams on the subject of the Allied peace proposals, that the French Minister received those proposals on the 25th ultimo, and communicated them the same day to the Greek Government. The latter at once circulated them which adjourned until the 25th ultimo to consider them. This adjournment was subsequently extended to the 27th.

The Greek press was unanimous in denouncing the proposals in an the one word "Skata," the only translation of which is an old English word of four letters in habitual use in our public schools and universities. The word was applied to the Allies, and the fact that as much as 100 drachmas are said to have been paid for a single number of this journal was cited by other newspapers as proof positive that the term of opprobrium was not only deserved but had the sanction of an enlightened democracy. I cannot help thinking that a paper in England which had the effrontery to print such a headline would also rapidly have been sold out, quite apart from the rest of its

Subsequent reflection did not abate the hostility of the press, and, for the first time since I have been here, articles hostile to Great Britain appeared. We were accused of having secured for ourselves Mesopotamia and Palestine, which were calculated by Mahomeds, and left the Christian population of Turkey to their fate. Quotations appeared from earlier declarations of British and Allied statesmen

E 4147 900 44]

No. 95a

Sir R. Graham to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received April 20.)

My Lord,

"With regard to the recent discussions on the question of the French protectorate in the Levant, we are in a position to affirm that this question was raised again at the Near Eastern Conference in Paris last March, when were discussed the commissions to be created to deal with the problems arising out of the abolition of the Capitulations. M. Poincaré stated that the French protectorate existed, confirming once more the French point of view, to the effect that the protectorate is only abolished as far as

the Levant is concerned. M. Poincaré announced the abolition of the French protectorate in the Levant.

persons and religious communities have recourse to the safeguarding of their interests in the Levant."

I have, &c.

R. GRAHAM

P.S.—Since writing the above despatch a further article has appeared in the "Messaggero" in which it is stated that the writer is authorised to announce that the article quoted above as a semi-official announcement has in fact no official character whatever. The "Messaggero" makes this statement with satisfaction as it considers the acknowledgment of the French right to ceremonial honours to be most detrimental to Italian prestige. As, however, the article appeared in all the newspapers as a semi-official statement, it seems likely that the Italian authorities originally intended it to be so, but finding that they had miscalculated its effect on public opinion have now changed their mind.

R. G.

denouncing the Turk and all his works, and holding up the liberation of the Christian inhabitants of Turkey as one of the objects of the war. The fact that the Allied proposals appeared to place the Turks and Greeks on the same footing as regards their treatment of minorities was felt to be a burning injustice and a gratuitous insult offered to a former ally in order to curry favour with an enemy. It was pointed out with comprehensible bitterness that several hundred thousand Moslems had lived peacefully in Greece during the period when the Turks were massacring the Christian races wholesale in Turkey, and that, at this very moment, the future policy of Greece depended largely on the manner in which the thirty-five Turkish Deputies would vote in the Athens Parliament.

In the general abuse of the peace proposals party recriminations were not long in reasserting themselves. The Royalist press naturally laid the whole blame for the present state of affairs on the shoulders of M. Venizelos, whose policy of adventure had

recent papers retorted with
telling the Venizelists a lesson
at negotiating when invited to

which in the House of Lords helped to
up to the armistice proposals

from Turkey, the claimer died down in the belief that Turkey would
peace proposals would fall to the ground. For it is a remarkable phenomenon that although Greece has been at war for the best part of ten years and is exhausted financially, the nation, as a whole, would, even now, even though it than accept a peace which is felt to be a betrayal of the unredeemed Greeks in the of the proved military superiority of the Greek army. I do not think it is doubtful that there would be a genuine popular outburst of joy were it announced to-morrow that the peace negotiations had been definitely dropped, and I am convinced that, in that event, the Greek forces would, with the moral backing of a Great Power, be capable of a prolonged and serious effort.

Having dealt with the popular aspect of this question, it may be of interest to report its treatment in the Assembly. In face of the violent and general abuse of the peace proposals, I thought it would be well to attempt to explain to some of the more

guilty, and the very real advantages which a peace on the basis proposed could bring to Greece. I therefore invited General Dauglis, the Venizelist leader M. Bonassos, the

Deputy, and M. Stratos, at one time Prime Minister, to come and see me

themselves. They were good enough to come at different times and I asked

at the situation as a whole. The war was ruining Greece and most of present proposals, although they did not give Greece all she wanted, were the best which the Allies believed, the Turks would accept, therefore they were the best which it was any one proposing. They would, if accepted by the Turks, which was not at all certain, secure to Greece a territory far more extensive than any Greek could have hoped for ten years ago, and large enough to absorb all the energies of the country for many years to come. I recognised that the question of the unredeemed Greeks was one that must be solved in accordance with the principles of justice, and I had no doubt that the League of Nations would find means to protect them.

General Dauglis and M. Stratos both agreed that Greece needed peace above all else but they did not conceal their feeling that the terms offered were unjust and

minor. They blamed the Greek Government for the manner in which Greek affairs had been managed since 1920. M. Bonassos, who had had experience of Turkish government as a Deputy in Macedonia, was more bolshewic, and declared roundly that, greatly as Greece desired peace, he would prefer to see her continue the war rather than leave the unredeemed Greeks unprotected, as they were by the proposals. The old Ottoman Empire was a heterogeneous State in which the non-Turkish elements were so important that they could secure some protection by condoning. The new Turkey would be a homogeneous State in which the small minorities which did exist would be

and were denaturalised for
including the
a discussion.

enough had been made public to justify
continue to direct the affairs of the country. Was it true that the
accepted the mediation of the Powers and communicated to His Majesty's Government

Government had placed themselves unreservedly in the hands
accepted unreservedly or with reservations, and, if the latter,
pled unreservedly, the Assembly should
should be no

nt could not give an account of their actions
at the present critical stage; to do so would be ruinous, and if another Government
came in they would be in the same position. If M. Stratos desired to move a vote of
censure on general grounds, let him do

M. Stratos replied that, if M. Gounaris's
flous are had lost the right of criticizing policy
negotiate with the Treaty of Sevres as representing the
The British Minister for Foreign Affairs had stated that, instead
his had placed the Greek case unreservedly in the hands

M. Gounaris answered that he would not reply until the proper time came
having accepted the peace proposals
to which M. Baltazzi replied that the armistice alone had been accepted. Would
M. Bonasson have refused it? The latter replied that he certainly would. If he were
in power he would invite the King to return to the front. M. Stratos again returned
to the charge and criticised the management of the campaign by the
M. Gounaris had acknowledged the necessity of evacuating A
M
nd that he had done any such thing, and again refused to say
on the Greek case unreservedly in the hands of the Powers or not

or not maintaining
the alliance with the Powers. After he had been howled down, General Danglis read
a very long declaration on behalf of the Venizelists to the effect that the decisions of
the Powers had produced astonishment and constituted a unique example of the
inference of diplomacy to the fate of a Christian population. Greece had, at the
bidding of the Allies, liberated the populations of Thrace and Asia Minor
forced to put them back under the yoke. The Government had allowed it
to be isolated diplomatically and financially and was not even properly represented in
London or Paris, though eminent men had offered their services. In spite of this

how the Government had continued the cat
names had been victorious. Mr. Lloyd
Greece deserved more than what was granted by the Treaty of
had not seized the opportunity to accept Allied intervention. From that moment
Government was responsible for all that followed. They had failed to keep it
army supplied with men and munitions and had had to withdraw after a victorious
advance. The army had given the Government victories, but the Government had
given the country a diplomatic defeat culminating in the present Allied proposals.
After incurring the displeasure of the Allies, they had been forced to place the Greek
case unreservedly in their hands. The Liberal Party called on the Government to
perform a patriotic duty and make way for a more competent Government which might
yet save the country. The Liberal Party appealed to the Chamber to overthrow the
Government and thus enable the nation to extricate itself from the dangers into which
the Government had led it.

In reply to this declaration, M. Gounaris accused the Liberals of intriguing
against their country. He had exhausted every means to bridge the
the parties, but had received no help from the Liberals. These observations were
followed by an uproar, and the Liberals left the Chamber in a body. After they had
gone M. Gounaris explained that he was not accusing the Liberals in the Chamber,
but those abroad.

The vote of confidence was then taken, and resulted in the Government's securing
103 votes to 52, the rest abstaining from voting.

The above account will, I hope, have given a fair idea of the feeling in the country
and the Chamber regarding the peace proposals. The attitude of the Government
has easy to define. In the first place, they are of course bound by their action in
placing the Greek case in the hands of the Powers. M. Baltazzi acknowledged that
this consideration was paramount in his mind when accepting the armistice, but

neither he nor the Prime Minister have referred to it when talking of the peace
proposals, and it is significant that M. Gounaris has only referred to the
Chamber. I do not attach undue importance to this last fact, which was evidently
dictated by tactical motives and probably saved the Government from a defeat. Nor
have I, up to now, pressed the point that the Government were not, as a matter of
fact, free agents, because the time does not seem to me to have come to do so. The
Turks have not yet replied even to the armistice proposals, and the Greeks seem
justified in marking time until they do so.

I have, however, called the attention of the Government to the attitude of the
press and to the harm that has been done by not sufficiently preparing the public for
sacrifices that have long appeared to me inevitable. Both M. Gounaris and M. Baltazzi
replied that they had not themselves expected the proposals to be so unfavourable to
Greece. They knew the friendly sentiments of His Majesty's Government and were
acquainted with the lines of the settlement which your Lordship would try to obtain,
and they had expected that the Allied proposals would coincide with your Lordship's
views much more closely than had proved to be the case. I have
arguments at my disposal, as reported in my telegram, to
the most favourable light, and I have little doubt that the
accept them if they were able to disregard public opinion. If, however, they attempt
to do this the result will be their defeat in the Chamber and the formation of a
Government pledged to continue the war at all costs.

The point on which public opinion is undoubtedly most moved is
Greek population in Asia Minor, and I much fear that no Greek Govern-
able to begin evacuation before they can persuade the public here that it
can remain secure in their homes after the Greek troops have left. In it
I would venture to remind your Lordship of the depth to which public opinion in
England was stirred at the time of the Jasson raid by the telegram announcing,

truly, that the lives of British women and children were in danger at
It was then a question of a few hundreds exposed to a very
problematical danger. It is now a question of hundreds of thousands exposed to a
evil which the experience of the last eight years has proved to be a terrible one.
If one also considers that there is a large Greek army now protecting this point

can continue to do so for a long time to come, the d
I know that your Lordship realises the position

the great difficulty in restoring peace in the East.

As regards Thrace, I do not believe that the Government will have any great
difficulty in carrying through the Allied proposals. After all, these proposals give to
Greece the better part of the province, and the common Turco-Bulgarian frontier is
not a question upon which Greek public opinion is likely to become very ex-
The Greek Government have certainly tried to interest the Serbian and Roumanian
Governments in this matter, but, unless these two agree to make common cause
which at present appears unlikely, I do not anticipate that we shall hear a
of the question.

I have, &c.

F. O. LINDLEY

E 4231 53 44]

No. 97

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received April 24)

(No. 7)

M. 12

Constantinople, April 18, 1922

ON the 15th April, relative to the question
of the exact arrangement visiting the Greek Patriarch at Easter, I at once placed myself
in communication with my French colleague. I had already learnt that the Italian
High Commissioner had received instructions from Rome upholding his point of view.

2. While communications were passing with the French High Commissioner,
General Pellé expressed regret that he could not on these instructions authorise the visit.

3. I thereupon instructed Mr. Ryan to pay the visit, but to take steps to make it

[3975]

20

E 4263 '900 '44]

No. 97A

Count de Sals to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received April 24)

(No. 64)

My Lord,

Rome April 21, 1922.

GENERAL GOURAUD, the French High Commissioner for Syria, was received last week in audience by the Pope. Afterwards, as is usual, he visited the Cardinal Secretary of State, and, later, the French Ambassador gave a luncheon in his honour, at which Cardinal Gasparri was present.

The visit has aroused considerable interest and given rise to speculation in the press in connection with the French claim to the protectorate of Catholics in the East.

It was noticed that General Gouraud was wearing the Grand Cordon of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, conferred upon him by Benedict XV as a mark of benevolent attitude towards Catholics in Syria. The "Ides Napoléon," during the visit, contrasted the friendly relations ex-

isting between the French and the British policy of Zaiman and favour shown to the British Government.

In the course of the audience, which was a lengthy one, the question of the French claim to the protectorate of Catholics in the East was discussed. The Vatican supported the French claim to the detriment of Italy as well as of Great Britain.

This article has been followed by an apparently inspired *démarche* from the pen of the Vatican. It points out that the Vatican have adopted an entirely correct and logical attitude. By maintaining, in so far as they are concerned, the *status quo* until the question has been settled one way or the other, they are taking the only possible course—one which can in no way be taken to imply a new step prejudicial to Italy.

I have, &c.
(For the Minister).

CECIL DORMER

most evil elements in the country. If the Greeks had to deal with the Sultan they could win through, as he stood for something which they knew and with which they could deal.

I said the Patriarch exaggerated in saying that the Foreign Ministers had taken too much interest in the minorities. I was true that that was the most immediate issue, but they had not disregarded the wider issue between Turkey and the Allies. The question of the minorities formed part of that wider issue. The evacuation of Asia Minor had become necessary. Had the only of the Greco-Turkish issue they might have solved it more easily in the interests of the minorities. If Great Britain cared only for her own interests, she would have intervened herself in the minorities. We saw, however, in the question of the minorities a question of honour and humanity—above all, a question of honour—and I repeated that Lord Curzon had exerted himself to the utmost to provide real safeguards. The Patriarch had spoken of a psychological state, it not correspond with eventual realities. That was where men of character and high intelligence came in. If they shared the excited feeling of the populace, they would be low. If they saw that that feeling did not correspond with their own estimate of eventual realities, their role was to counteract it, as I had urged him to do. I said I was interested in what he had said about the Sultan, as I was myself convinced that there would be no stability in this country until the Sultan's authority was restored. If, however, he meant to say "Re-establish the Sultan's authority first and then make peace with him," what practical means was there of proceeding in that

The Patriarch admitted the difficulty. He said that if the Greeks had been allowed to go to Angora last year the object would have been achieved. I said that the Sultan's authority could not rest on Greek bayonets. I supposed he meant that we should have given the Greeks material support to finish the campaign. We had not in any other sense prevented them from going to Angora. The Patriarch, who had repeatedly said that the Allied attitude should not be determined by the existence of a particular regime in Greece, assented to this. I then said that the Turks also had their psychology, that the Greeks might have got to Angora, but would not have overrun Asia Minor, and that if the Sultan's cause were associated with that of the Greeks he would be damned in the eyes of all Turks, even the most moderate.

We did not carry the conversation further as I did not want to prolong my visit unduly.

The Patriarch expressed himself with much force and directness. He certainly would easily be carried away by his feelings. His estimate of French is unimpeachably good for a Greek prelate, but he is not quite as fluent as I had been led to expect, and one sees that he occasionally has some difficulty in finding appropriate words.

April 18, 1922

E 4371 5 44

No. 98

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to M. de Martino.

Your Excellency,

Foreign Office, April 27, 1922

YOU have been good enough to communicate to me verbally on instructions from M. Schanzer, the intelligence that an agreement has now been signed between the Italian and the Turkish Governments in virtue of which the latter grant to the former certain concessions for railways, public works and mines, the precise character of which is not yet specified. I learn that these concessions have been offered as a free gift by the Constantinople Government, and M. Schanzer assures me that there have been no dealings with Angora in this matter. It is stated that the agreement does not provide for any set-off or counter-concession by the Italian Government, nor for any understanding which can fetter or limit their political action. M. Schanzer surmises,

that this is merely their desire, while it is the firm intention of the Italian Government to take no step opposed to the policy of the Allies, and that he has in the past kept me loyally informed of what was passing and would continue to do so in the future. He reminds me that he had acquainted me with the Turkish offer

at Paris, and your Excellency yourself mentioned it to me at the same time. I am further assured that the Italian Government entertain no illusions as to the value of the concessions now gratuitously offered to them by the Turks; but that they distrust the benefits secured to them by the Tripartite Agreement and those economic guarantees which the assistance of M. Schanzer, were included last month in the Paris Agreement. Accordingly they have felt unable to refuse the Turkish offer and to accept the agreement.

2. I note that you will shortly communicate to me the text of this document, and, to view of the message of M. Schanzer communicated to me by you. I doubt not that on examining it I shall find that it impinges on no specific British interest. I desire, however, to submit without delay some observations of a more general nature on this remarkable and, as it appears to me, unfortunate proceeding.

I recall that at Paris M. Schanzer informed me not of the Turkish offer, but of the fact that certain proposals had been made. I also recollect your mentioning the matter to me in a sentence before I left for Paris, and my reply to you advising extreme caution. From that date to the present moment I have received from you no information whatever as to the course of the negotiations proceeding. I did indeed learn from British representatives at Constantinople that they were believed to be taking place, and I did not fail a few days ago to warn you again in writing. I can only regret that my representations should have remained so entirely ineffective, and I feel unable to admit that His Majesty's Government have been treated with the frankness they might have expected from the loyalty which is claimed by the Italian Government for and intended to.

3. It appears to me to be wholly immaterial that the Italian Government have negotiated at Constantinople alone and not at Angora. It is well known that the aims of the two Turkish parties are substantially identical, and that what is gained or lost at Angora would not venture to conclude any agreement of more than passing importance without the cognizance of the Angora authorities. Furthermore, I have received reliable information that the latter are perfectly well aware of if they actually participated in, the negotiations. In any case, the evil effects of this agreement will inevitably extend to the negotiations in which the Allies will be presently involved with the Turkish Nationalists.

4. I fully accept M. Schanzer's assurance that the obligations of this agreement are only unilateral, i.e., on the Turkish side. However, that the public opinion of Europe and Asia, based on a long familiarity with the processes and objects of Oriental diplomacy, will not derive much consolation from this assurance. It is not the practice even of Western Governments to give away valuable concessions gratuitously to foreign interests, still less has any Turkish Government ever been suspected of such innocent generosity. M. Schanzer has, indeed, in his message to me, indicated himself with clear insight the motives and thoughts which have inspired Enver Pasha in concluding the agreement.

5. It will inevitably find themselves fettered by the loyalty to their Allies will drag them in one reproaches of the Turks in the other. I cannot conceive, therefore, that the conclusion of this agreement can have any other result than to render the Turkish Government more unwilling to accept the very moderate and equitable terms which the Allies decided at Paris only last month to press upon them. In so far as M. Schanzer's action

near East, it appears to be inconsistent with a due regard for the interests not merely of Great Britain, but of the Allies as a whole.

6. In spite of past disappointments, I had hoped that on the basis of the Paris terms the three Allies would thenceforward present a united front to Turkey; that they would renounce petty and selfish gains in order to secure the common good, and I still cherish the profound conviction that only by such conduct can that success be obtained. For advantages, the illusory nature of which M. Schanzer recognises quite clearly, the prospect of achieving that success has been deliberately jeopardised. The agreement which M. Schanzer has signed may differ in form and in detail from that which was concluded last year by his predecessor in office, but in its principle it is no less objectionable. For once more we have the spectacle, which no one has condemned more of the three Great Powers separating itself from the remainder in order to negotiate

a clandestine agreement with the Turks behind the back of the others. In these circumstances, I am compelled to present to you the strongest protest of His Majesty's Government against the transaction which you have reported to me.

I have, &c.

CURZON OF KEDLESTON

E 4425 27 44.

No 90

Sir H. St. John to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received May 1)

(No 381)

My Lord,

THE local press announced a few days ago the appointment of three Turkish officials to high administrative posts. The names of the officials were not given.

2. These three appointments illustrate significantly the temper of the Angora Government. Sabit Bey was Vali of Kharput from 1914 to February 1915. Abdul Halik was Vali of Bulis from March 1914 to September 1915. Muammer Bey was Vali of Sivas from 1913 to February 1916. Each acquired notoriety as a forceful exponent of the policy of deporting and massacring Christians. Each was arrested on charges of complicity in these crimes, and they were all three in due course deported to Malta. Their full records will be found in the files relative to the Malta deportees. Their appointment at the present juncture to high administrative posts is of a piece with the election of the notorious Ferid Bey of Duzdare to a post in the Angora Cabinet to replace Rauf Bey, the resignation of whom, together with other members of the Angora Government, I reported in my despatch No. 35 of the 24th Jan.

I have, &c.

FRANK R. MICHOL

High Commissioner

E 4427 53 44

No 100

Sir H. St. John to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received May 1)

(No 385)

My Lord,

Constantinople April

WITH reference to previous despatches relative to the situation at Constantinople, I have the honour to state that considerable efforts have been made recently to restore harmony between the two factions into which the Greek episcopacy split over the election, which was of course merely the culminating episode in a purely political struggle between Constantinianists and Venizelists. Mr. Metaxas would appear to have realised that the election can only be detrimental to the cause of Hellenism generally.

3. Matters appear to be in a state of some confusion, or at least a truce, at Constantinople. It was obvious that there was any question of a reunion since that the "Bey, here, at Constantinople, was not a member of the assembly, on the ground that the latter would never consent to allow the validity of the election to be called in question.

4. The present position is that the dissident Bishops are striving to collect a Council of Bishops of their own way of thinking in Constantinople on the 3rd May. The constituted bodies of the Patriarchate took a decision on the 26th April, giving the dissidents until the 25th April to reconsider their recalcitrant attitude.

5. The main interest of this question at the present time is in its effect on the situation in Southern Asia Minor. If the Patriarch can bring the dissident Bishops into line, and establish some sort of a *modus vivendi* with the Athens Government, he will obviously be in a much better position to influence the situation in the Smyrna area in accordance with his own views. From this point of view a rapprochement is not altogether to be desired as the Patriarch is generally supposed to be

the full weight of his authority after effecting a composition with the Constantinians, the movement would greatly gain in strength. Your Lordship will have observed that in his conversation with Mr Ryan on the 17th April (see my despatch No 378 of the 18th April), while professing himself the most moderate of men, he said nothing to dissociate himself definitely from the Micrasian movement.

6. In this connection I enclose a précis of reports from very secret sources on the Papouzas in regard to the Micrasian movement. I regard these reports with a good deal of suspicion, but they are at least useful as indicating the trend of rumour and opinion in Venizelist circles here from which the compilers of the reports ultimately

7. The Patriarch has been seeking to consolidate his position. The Patriarch of Antioch is said to have recognised him and to have sent a letter of congratulations. The Patriarch of Jerusalem is said to have declined to act similarly though no formal letter has been received from him. The Patriarch of Alexandria stands out. Mgr Gernamon, the Bishop of Amman (one of the leading prelates, and himself, it will be remembered, a candidate for the Patriarchal throne) just returned from a mission to Belgrade to seal the definite recognition of the Church of Yugoslavia, under a Patriarch of its own. This means that the head of that Church will also support the Patriarch of Constantinople.

8. I believe the Patriarch to be really waiting on events, and to be concentrating for the present on an effort to strengthen his position all round, rather than of how he will use his influence in the long run. There are indications that he is not indifferent even to the possibility of working with the Sultan, should that prove to be the best way of protecting the interests of his flock when things settle down in the Near East.

9. Meanwhile the "Orthodox Turk" movement in Anatolia continues to attract a good deal of attention. Rumours have been put about to the effect that the Bolsheviks have been taking a hand in this game, and have agreed to put the Orthodox Church

future

I have, &c
HUBERT RUMBOLD
High Commissioner.

Enclosure 1 in No. 100.

Précis of Secret Report.

RECENT reports from secret sources indicate that efforts have been made during the last month to readjust the position of the Greek National Defence Organisation in Constantinople so as to enable it to work in with the local anti-evacuation movement at Smyrna. The Patriarchate and Colonel Kouklis are represented as playing the

relations between the Venizelist organisation here and the Athens Government. (2) the question of the attitude of the Athens Government towards the Micrasian movement, and (3) the question of providing a basis on which the numerous Venizelist officers in Constantinople can join up for service in Asia Minor.

secret reports indicate that an attempt is being made to reconcile differences of opinion in the National Defence Organisation here, to co-ordinate its activities with those of similar organisations elsewhere, and to place the whole National Defence machine at the disposal of the Patriarch. They further indicate that negotiations were on foot between the organisation here and the Athens authorities in March, but that towards the end of March the Athens Government were unwilling to commit themselves to support the Micrasian movement, and made some half-hearted overtures to General Papouzas by a General who was sent to the Government in the event of evacuation being decided on. General Papouzas himself is represented as having definitely thrown himself into the Micrasian movement after his last visit to Athens. The reports credit the Patriarch with an important part in conjunction with the General in promoting the movement, and making preparations for the proclamation of an independent local Government in case of need. It is even suggested that, if such a Government should be proclaimed, the Patriarch would himself proceed to Smyrna in order to give his support, and that the treasure of the Greek churches would be made available to finance it. The Patriarch and Kouklis are said to have drawn up a plan of action which is based on discussions between Mgr Molitis and M. Venizelos in the United States of America, and which has been submitted to Papouzas.

Lastly, the reports indicate that great progress has been made with arrangements to enable the Venizelist officers in Constantinople to return to active service in Asia Minor army. In this matter the leading rôle is attributed to K. The influence of Generals Jannou, Zembekakis and Mazarakis is said to be considerable. The plan is said to be to have a large number of officers remaining in Constantinople, and there are said to be some

4 June 2 in No. 100

Extract from the "Bosphore" of April 5

L'ÉGLISE DU PHANAR ET LA NATION ORIENTALE

prendre connaissance du projet d'accord concernant la réconciliation au sein de la grande Église, desuée à la suite de l'attitude des métropolitains dissidents dans la question de l'élection patriarcale, ont longuement discuté les conditions de base de cet accord.

Celles-ci sont au nombre de trois :

1. Abandon du Patriarcat de toute activité tendant à renverser par la violence le régime actuel hellénique.
2. Aide active au renforcement du front, soit morale, soit matérielle, sans réserve.
3. Convocation, après la réunion de l'assemblée nationale locale, d'un conseil où la discussion sur l'élection patriarcale et les actes s'y rapportant ne sera pas exclue.

Les délibérations, qui furent longues, ont abouti à faire l'unanimité sur la nécessité d'une entente et sur la réserve aussi qu'il y avait lieu de s'en tenir qu'on ait pu jamais imputer au Patriarcat du Phanar une action tendant à renverser le régime politique en Grèce.

Les deux corps constitués ont, en conséquence, décidé qu'une délégation composée de membres de l'Assemblée nationale de Grèce à l'effet de protester contre les imputations dont le Patriarcat fut victime et de transmettre en même temps les vœux et les souhaits de la grande Église à l'occasion de la fête nationale.

Le communiqué suivant a été publié par le Patriarcat :

Des questions soumises aux deux corps constitués, à la suite du rapport de la grande Église nationale ont été repoussées comme provenant de la part de prélats et se référant à une question religieuse. À la faveur cependant de la discussion y relative, il a

été décidé de donner à ce sujet, par écrit et par délégation spéciale, les assurances dues à l'autorité représentant à Constantinople l'État et l'armée grecs.

Les deux corps constitués, n'admettant pas la moindre discussion de l'élection patriarcale, ont entendu sa Sainteté Meletios IV n'empêchera pas de discuter une proposition émanant d'un ou de plusieurs du grand Synode au sujet de la dernière élection patriarcale.

"Le conseil approuve qu'il soit fait part aux intéressés d'Église la concorde nécessaire et indispensable pour le salut de la nation

E 4429 27 44]

No. 101

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 1.)

Constantinople, April 25, 1922.
I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22nd instant to point out the bad impression which had been produced and by the appointment to various responsible posts under the Government of men whose record in connection with Armenian massacres was to be bad. (Please see my despatch No. 381 of the 24th instant.) The appointments were a significant indication of the frame of mind of the Government.

It is true that the execution of four persons was calculated to make a bad impression on the form of Government.

3. Izet Pasha then complained of the manner in which certain organs of the press had treated the subject. He thought that the press had been unfairly treated.

HORACE RUMBOLD.
High Commissioner.

E 4430 5 44]

No. 102

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 1.)

(No. 391.)

My Lord

Constantinople, April 25, 1922.

I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of the reply of the Angora Government to the note which the Allied Governments addressed to that Government on the 23rd instant. This reply was handed to me by the Angora representative, Hamid Bey, on the 23rd instant, and I had the honour to send your Lordship a full summary of it in my telegram No. 219 of the 23rd instant.

My Lord, I have considered it desirable to submit to your Lordship, and the present despatch supplements those telegrams.

3. It was to be foreseen that the Angora Government would be placed in a difficulty by the demand formulated by the Allied Governments that the Nationalists should accept the body of the peace conditions subject to the discussion of particular points before the evacuation of Asia Minor could commence. In its answer, the Angora Government requested that the evacuation of Asia Minor should be postponed to the conclusion of the armistice, and proposed in terms the possibility of a preliminary conference at Izmud in order to find a terrain d'entente which would permit of subsequent peace negotiations.

4. The principal impression produced by the perusal of the enclosed note is that it is mainly in the nature of propaganda. The first portion of the note is an attempt to distort the intentions of the Allies with regard to the evacuation of Asia Minor. The alleged ruthless proceedings of the Greek army in Asia Minor are quoted as a reason for a speedy evacuation of the territory occupied by that army. The Angora Government even goes so far as to accuse the Greeks of massacre and the burning of villages in the Sokia region, which has only just been evacuated by the Italians. There is nothing either in the reports received from Smyrna by my Italian colleague or by myself to show that the Greeks have committed any excesses in occupying the Sokia district, and it is not materially possible that, when the Angora note was despatched, the Nationalists could have had cognisance of the state of the district in question. I consider, therefore, that their statement under this head is purely imaginary.

5. The omission in the note from Angora of all reference to the intention of the Allied Powers to safeguard the Caliphate is significant, as also is the passage to the effect that the Turkish people should not be deprived, owing to their being a Muslim nation, of rights which are naturally recognised in the case of Christian peoples. This is propaganda which should be countered in any reply which the Allies return to the present note.

6. The Angora Government reaffirms the statement, so often heard here, that, of all the defeated nations, Turkey is the one which has suffered most. This does not take into account the fact that the note states that, as the bulk of the peace conditions only interest the Great Powers, there is no reason why those Powers should maintain a Greek army of invasion in Anatolia in order to restrict the right of discussion of the Angora Government. This statement is perhaps the most inaccurate one in the whole note.

7. Finally, the note proposes a preliminary meeting at Izmud between plenipotentiaries of the Angora Government and plenipotentiaries of the Allies to elucidate the different points of view.

8. In handing me the note, Hamid Bey explained that if this proposal were accepted, the Government of the State, Mustapha Kemal would have power to take decisions on the spot without reference to Angora. It would therefore be desirable that the Allied delegates should have similar powers.

9. I have impressed on my colleagues that these statements indicate that Mustapha Kemal has in view something more than the elucidation of "particular points." His line with the statement made in the note, that the bulk of the peace conditions concerned the Allied Governments, a statement to which the Italian High Commissioner had taken great exception. I expressed the view that an acceptance of the proposal would be to the detriment of the Allies, the Greeks and the Central Government.

I reminded my colleagues that Mustapha Kemal was well acquainted with the main lines of the proposed settlement, and that he would hardly put himself out to go to Izmud in order to discuss secondary issues. Hamid Bey had said that if the proposal to go to Izmud were not accepted Mustapha Kemal would be unable to go to any other locality. I pointed out that, if he were to go to Izmud, or indeed to any place of that kind indicated by the Nationalists, I saw no point in the proposed preliminary conference.

10. On the other hand, my colleagues and I are agreed that it would be unwise to close the door to further discussion. We are also inclined to think that the Nationalists do not desire to terminate discussions. The Kemalist army appears to be weary of fighting, the Nationalists have their eyes on the Genoa Conference, and are probably reluctant to take a plunge in any direction before they know how the position of the Russians is likely to be affected by the Genoa Conference.

11. I have only indicated two considerations which must be present in the minds of the Nationalists, though there are no doubt others.

12. I am forwarding a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister at Athens.

I have, &c.

HORACE RIMBOLD,

High Commissioner

Enclosure 1 in No. 102.

Hamid Bey to Sir H. Rimbald.

Excellence,

Constantinople le 23 avril 1922

J'ai l'honneur de transmettre ci-joint à votre Excellence et avec prière de faire parvenir à destination la note responsive que son Excellence Youssef Kemal Bey, Ministre des Affaires étrangères du Gouvernement de la grande Assemblée nationale de Turquie, vient d'adresser par mon intermédiaire à son Excellence Lord Curzon, Ministre des Affaires étrangères du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique.

Enclosure 2 in No. 102.

Hamid Bey to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.

Angora, le 22 avril 1922

Les conséquences logiques des buts poursuivis. Il avait donc été, dans sa note responsive du 5 avril 1922, à être en outre un point de vue des Puissances alliées qui se proposent d'exclure toute possibilité du renouvellement des hostilités. En effet, lorsque, dans leur note du 22 mars 1922 au sujet de l'armistice, leurs Excellences les Ministres des Affaires étrangères des trois Puissances recommandaient instamment la suspension immédiate des hostilités, ils déclaraient avoir un vœu de rétablir la paix dans le Proche-Orient et d'être mis à même de faire des propositions pour l'évacuation de l'Asie Mineure, sous nouvelles portes de vive et de bien. De même, il est spécifié dans la note du 26 mars 1922 relative aux conditions de paix que l'armistice a été proposé avec l'intention déclarée d'assurer l'évacuation pacifique de l'Asie Mineure par les forces grecques et la restauration de la souveraineté turque sur l'ensemble de cette région. De plus, son Excellence Lord Curzon, Ministre des Affaires étrangères de Grande-Bretagne, avait déclaré, le 30 mars 1922, à la Chambre des Lords que l'invitation à accepter un armistice était accompagnée par l'assurance du fait que l'armistice serait suivi par des mesures pour l'évacuation de l'Asie Mineure par les forces grecques. Le peuple turc,

en considération cette série de déclarations, espérant qu'il serait procédé à l'évacuation sans délai de l'Asie Mineure simultanément avec l'armistice. Or, il a été constaté avec regret que, dans leur dernière communication du 15 avril 1922, les Puissances alliées ont déclaré ne pouvoir accepter une évacuation immédiate accompagnant l'armistice et subordonné cette évacuation à l'acceptation de l'ensemble des conditions de paix.

Mon Gouvernement veut s'abstenir de discuter ici le fait que les Puissances alliées ont invoqué comme motifs de cette remise de l'évacuation le refus probable du Gouvernement hellénique de souscrire avant le début des négociations à une condition de cette sorte et le renouvellement éventuel de la guerre en Thrace, actes qui, s'ils ne pouvaient impliquer de la part du Gouvernement une opposition effective au cours et au bout de paix des grandes Puissances et attireraient sur lui le blâme et la réprobation universels. Dans tous les cas, les motifs précités prouvent combien le point de vue turc au sujet de l'évacuation est conforme aux intérêts de la paix ainsi

qu'à la justice et à l'équité. Cependant, mon Gouvernement sent la nécessité d'insister sur le fait que dans les territoires occupés, autrefois si riches et si prospères, l'armée hellénique ajoute tous les jours de nouveaux incendies et de nouvelles dévastations aux crimes qu'elle a déjà perpétrés et augmente par de nouvelles victimes le nombre de musulmans innocents massacrés.

la population musulmane, autrefois si aisée, depuis l'occupation grecque sont atteintes par les témoignages humains de tous les étrangers neutres, y compris les délégués des Croix-Rouges qui ont visité les régions envahies.

Mon Gouvernement ne veut pas croire que les Puissances alliées, dont les efforts humanitaires tendant à la protection des minorités chrétiennes sont connus, puissent consentir à abandonner encore un certain temps à leur triste sort les majorités musulmanes gémissant sous l'occupation hellénique et rester simples spectatrices de leurs souffrances.

C'est dans cet espoir que mon Gouvernement fait appel aux sentiments dont sont animés leurs Excellences les Ministres des Affaires étrangères des Puissances alliées et les prie instamment de délivrer un moment plus tôt nos frères musulmans innocents et malheureux de l'administration cruelle et insupportable de l'ennemi en faisant selon leurs propres intentions, suivre l'armistice d'une évacuation immédiate.

Mon Gouvernement nous fit le ferme espoir que les Puissances alliées accepteraient un moment plus tôt de pouvoir consentir à l'ensemble des conditions de

en précédemment l'honneur de porter à votre connaissance d'acceptation de son point de vue relatif à l'armistice. prêt, conformément à l'invitation contenue dans la note du 26 mars 1922, à envoyer des délégués en vue d'étudier les conditions de paix. Toutefois, parmi les conditions proposées se trouvent des points qui sont en contradiction avec les principes que les Ministres des Affaires étrangères des Puissances alliées ont eu constamment présent à l'esprit et sur lesquels se fondent leurs propositions, ainsi qu'avec les assurances suivantes données officiellement et publiquement en 1918 par M. le Président du Conseil de Grande-Bretagne : "Nous ne faisons pas la guerre pour dépouiller la Turquie de sa capitale et des régions riches et civilisées de l'Asie Mineure et de la Thrace qui sont turques en race d'une façon prédominante." Cependant, les principes contenus dans la note du 26 mars, et visant à rétablir la nation et la souveraineté turques dans les territoires qui peuvent être considérés comme leur appartenant avec les pouvoirs qui permettent à la Turquie de reprendre une existence nationale vigoureuse et indépendante, et assurer aux musulmans le régime le plus équitable. Or, ne différenciant pas des buts pour l'obtention desquels le peuple turc a subi tant de sacrifices, mon Gouvernement ne veut pas perdre l'espoir de voir adapter aux principes précédemment énoncés les conditions de paix qui ne s'y opposent pas et par suite d'arriver à conclure un accord sur l'ensemble des conditions proposées.

Mon Gouvernement se permet de répéter encore une fois que le peuple turc ne désire rien autre chose que de vivre indépendant et d'être en sécurité sur les territoires lui appartenant, de se débarrasser de chaînes politiques, judiciaires et économiques entravant son libre essor et de ne pas être privé par le seul fait d'être un peuple musulman, des droits que l'on reconnaît tout naturellement aux peuples chrétiens.

Parmi les États vaincus, la Turquie a été éprouvée la plus durement par sa participation à la guerre générale par la perte de vastes pays de l'étendue de plusieurs royaumes. Dans ces conditions, et alors que les buts légitimes et modérés du peuple turc sont admis en principe par les Puissances alliées, mon Gouvernement estime que la subordination de l'évacuation à l'acceptation de l'ensemble des conditions de paix a pour seuls résultats de permettre à l'ennemi, durant les mois qui s'écouleront pour établir les conditions de paix, de se mettre en état de reprendre les hostilités, ainsi que de fournir à l'ennemi l'occasion d'attenter d'une façon continuelle et toujours sur une échelle plus grande, à la vie et à l'honneur et aux biens des musulmans se trouvant dans les territoires dont l'attribution à la Turquie n'est contestée par personne.

Malheureusement, la plus grande partie des conditions de paix proposées intéressent uniquement les grandes Puissances alliées, mon Gouvernement est convaincu qu'elles ont pas besoin de maintenir en Asie Mineure une armée grecque d'invasion afin de restreindre son droit de discussion. A ce sujet, je crois devoir ajouter que les

Puissances alliées ont laissé mon Gouvernement dans l'enceinte de la capitale, quels sont les points qu'elles considèrent comme partie intégrante de la question ?

répondant à diverses interprétations, selon les différents points de vue, présenterait des inconvénients et donnerait lieu à discussion, or, toutes ces discussions aboutissent pour résultat de prolonger les souffrances de l'occupation imposée à la population.

Insistant sur ces considérations et tout en remerciant leurs Excellences les Ambassadeurs des Puissances étrangères des Puissances alliées pour les déclarations comme quoi satisfaction aurait été donnée dans une importante mesure à sa demande principale concernant l'évacuation, le Gouvernement de la grande Assemblée nationale de Turquie se voit obligé d'insister sur son point de vue relatif à la nécessité de commencer l'évacuation simultanément à ce qu'il a dit.

Néanmoins, je m'empresse de vous faire connaître, au nom de mon Gouvernement, afin d'éviter toutes pertes de temps que nécessiterait un échange de correspondance, de déterminer par les négociations verbales la question de savoir si en réalité les différents points de vue mis en avant dans le but d'arriver à la paix sans nouvelles pertes de vies et de biens sont conciliables ou non, et de pouvoir s'entendre de vive voix sur les points qui ont besoin d'être éclaircis, nos délégués plénipotentiaires sont prêts à se rencontrer à Ispah, à une date à fixer, avec les délégués plénipotentiaires des Puissances alliées, en vue d'ouvrir, en premier lieu, des pourparlers préparatoires qui pourraient trouver un terrain d'entente.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute considération.

YUSUF KEMAL,

Ministre des Affaires étrangères du Gouvernement
de la grande Assemblée nationale de Turquie

E 4432 5 44]

No 103.

Sur H. Rembold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston — (Received May 1,

(No. 391)

My Lord,

Constantinople, April 26, 1922.

ONE of the most striking features of the situation in this country during the past few weeks has been the hostility of Angora towards the Constantinople Government. The Grand National Assembly has of course, since its inception, claimed in theory to be the sole Government of Turkey but up to a short time ago, care was taken not to push this theory to its logical extreme. The new attitude dates from the moment when the Constantinople Government decided to send Ismet Pasha to London and Paris. This, as your Lordship is aware, was greatly resented in Angora as an attempt to cut the ground from under Yusuuf Kemal Bey, and the resentment was all the greater as the belief appears to be entertained at Angora that Ismet Pasha has gone against the Nationalist leaders there and is working for an understanding with Great Britain.

The reply of the Constantinople Government to the Paris proposals gave a fresh impetus to the new movement of hostility to the Constantinople Government. The reply was received in Angora with a great deal of indignation, and, though it was well known that the Angora Government was also made a ground of attack. The word went out from Angora that the statesmen of Constantinople were unwilling to see a conference held in the capital simply because they feared that if delegates of the Angora Government came here they would be welcomed by the whole population as representing the only real Government of Turkey.

It may be said that Angora now has a two-fold programme, and wishes not only to impose the National Pact on the Allies, but also to force the Allies into the position of accepting the National Pact. It is true that the National Pact is the only basis on which Great Britain is considered the only serious obstacle to

the realization of the double object, and is thought to be still supporting the Greeks, even to the extent of secretly encouraging the Vehmshin movement.

It is sometimes maintained in foreign circles that the evacuation of Asia Minor by the Greeks would deprive the Angora Government of its *raison d'être*, and that once the evacuation took place it would be easy enough to obtain a satisfactory settlement from an united Turkey. The only ground for hoping this is that there is undoubtedly dissension at Angora, and there are undoubtedly elements of some importance in the Grand National Assembly, who would welcome a return to the traditional order of things, in which the Sultan-Caliph would be the sovereign of a Constitutional State. Mustapha Kemal and his associates, however, are not of this mind. They wish to recover Constantinople, but they wish to exercise the same power in the whole of the Turkey that they now exercise in Anatolia, and to deprive the Sultan of all authority. For them the evacuation of Asia Minor by the Greeks is a step towards the realization of their larger programme as defined at the beginning of the year.

I have before me reports of speeches by members of the Angora Government which bear out the above impression. One of these is a report by the Commissioner of Finance on the financial and economic bearing of the Allied proposals. He is said to have said:

"I have before me reports of speeches by members of the Angora Government which bear out the above impression. One of these is a report by the Commissioner of Finance on the financial and economic bearing of the Allied proposals. He is said to have said:

"We feel that the most important consideration in regard to the future peace is that which concerns our economic independence, and I state without hesitation that this part of the Allied peace proposals is totally unacceptable for it involves no engagements towards us and only consists of empty words. What is granted with one hand is at the same time withdrawn with the other. The principal basis of our economic independence is the right and the power to impose taxes like any other nation. Although the peace conditions appear to acknowledge this right, to reality it is denied by the statement 'in order to protect foreign subjects against all abuses in the collection of taxes and against unreasonable impositions.' Similarly, the establishment of customs dues in conformity with the economic and financial necessities and interests of a country is the legitimate right of every Government, and the peace proposals appear to grant us this right, but it is nevertheless denied us by the statement 'no alteration of customs dues may be made except with the consent of the Governments interested.'"

The Commissioner of Finance apparently qualified his statement by saying that a settlement of the financial question might be possible and that certain undertakings might be given in regard to special taxation, but he insisted that there must be no restraint on Turkey's economic freedom and nothing which would infringe her political independence.

The following extracts from a speech reported to have been delivered by Mustapha Kemal himself at the beginning of April illustrate the double aim of the Angora Government:

"In such negotiations, the only place where there would be no interference from Angora. That is the reason why the Sublime Porte in the reply to the Allied proposals, proposed a meeting for a second peace conference. In the event of our proposal being favourably received, and provided the Greeks can be made to accept the conditions, a conference will be held three weeks later at a place designated by Angora, such as Ispah, Ineboli, or Trebizond, the Sublime Porte is doubtless aware of this also."

"Therefore, what Angora declares and desires will be carried out. We have forced those who signed the Treaty of Sèvres to kick away their signatures. It is we who have created this situation, and in these circumstances what have we to fear?"

obtained promises from M. Poincaré and M. Schanzer to the effect that Eastern Thrace would be restored to Turkey and that the Straits question would be settled in accordance with the National Pact, and that the two Ministers had asked in return that the armistice should be accepted without reserve. I cannot be certain that Yusuf K. went so far, and, if he did, I hesitate to believe that either M. Poincaré or M. Schanzer would have given him any assurances of so definite a kind. It cannot be doubted that France and Italy are regarded in Athens, as being only too ready to modify the Paris proposals in a sense favourable to Turkey and that Great Britain alone blocks it.

HORACE RIMBOLD,
High Commissioner

E 4467 5 44]

No. 104

War Office to Foreign Office. — (Received May 1)

Sir,

War Office, April 29, 1922

I AM commanded by the Army Council to forward for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, a copy of a telegram, dated the 26th April, 1922, from Lieutenant General Sir Charles Harington on the subject of the control of ports during the armistice in Anatolia.

2. I am to say that the Council are of opinion that the only really effective way of preventing reinforcements and material reaching the belligerents during the armistice would be to organise an efficient control at all the ports mentioned by General Harington. The port of Mersina is especially important, because large consignments of arms and ammunition are landed here en route to the Kemalists from France. As the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston is no doubt aware, definite information on this subject is obtained from very secret sources, which also indicate that the French Government may be directly concerned in this arms traffic.

The Council, however, consider that if control is to be established at all, this must be done in a manner which will be equally fair to both Greeks and Turks, that widespread co-operation between the members of all the Allied Governments will be essential. So far as the Greeks are concerned it seems probable that this difficulty would be experienced, as the loyal co-operation of our allies could be secured in helping to prevent the passage of reinforcements or war material to the Turkish army. But it is open to question whether the control at Turkish ports could be as effectively carried out and whether loyal co-operation would be forthcoming. In these circumstances the Council would be glad to know Lord Curzon's views on the subject of the matter.

4. I am to add that the Council agree with General Harington that if control of the ports is to be included in the scheme, then Mersina should be controlled, and that if it is considered impracticable to control the Turkish ports, then no control should be established at Greek ports.

5. It will be observed that there is no reference to the port of Trabzon. General Harington's telegram, due to the overland routes from the Caucasus whence supplies from Russia are received by the Kemalists. Any control in the Caucasus is out of the question, but the control of Trabzon should be considered with the other ports.

A copy of this letter is being sent to the Admiralty

I am, &c.
H. B. CURTIS

Enclosure in No. 104

General Harington to War Office.

(Telegraphic.)

Constantinople April 26, 1922

REFERENCE Annex 3 armistice scheme) to first meeting of Foreign Ministers, held at Quai d'Orsay which forms basis of study of military communications. It appears that during armistice no reinforcements or material are to be allowed to reach either belligerent army. The Allied scheme here, so far drafted, entrusts Allied control on Turkish ports of Trabzon and Adalia and

Greek ports of Smyrna and Mudania, but it seems to be equally necessary that Allied control should be installed at Turkish port of Mersina, which is in direct railway communication with Turkish front line and for Turkey is comparable in importance to Smyrna to Greeks. Railway is now working efficiently between Mersina and Turkish ports. I desire your views on this matter as to whether they are prepared to participate.

controls at further is considered impracticable it is a matter for consideration whether there should be none installed at latter

E 4466 5 44]

No. 105

Lord Hardinge to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston — (Received May 1)

(No. 1073)

HIS Majesty's Ambassador at Paris presents his compliments to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and has the honour to transmit herewith copy of a note from M. Poincaré, dated the 1st May, respecting the attitude of the Allies towards the reply of the Ankara Government.

Paris, May 1, 1922.

Enclosure in No. 105.

M. Poincaré to Lord Hardinge.

Ministère des Affaires Étrangères,
Paris, le 1^{er} mai 1922.

M. l'Ambassadeur,

L'AR en note en date du 26 avril votre Excellence a bien voulu me dire que le Gouvernement britannique, estimant peu désirable d'envoyer une députation, qu'il juge sans nous avec le Gouvernement d'Ankara, proposait de faire remettre par ses trois Hauts-Commissaires alliés au représentant de ce Gouvernement à Constantinople une réponse catégorique à sa dernière note. Votre Excellence ajoutant qu'en ce qui concerne le siège de la conférence, le choix l'hôtel était dans l'opinion du Gouvernement britannique, peu opportun, celui de Therapia lui paraissant préférable.

J'ai l'honneur de faire savoir à votre Excellence qu'en communiquant à l'Ambassadeur de la République à Londres le texte de la dernière réponse du Gouvernement d'Ankara, je lui priais, dès le 26 avril, de faire remarquer à Lord Curzon qu'à mon avis, si les réserves formulées par le Gouvernement d'Ankara n'étaient pas de nature à nous donner toute satisfaction du moins le ton général de sa communication manifestait clairement le désir d'arriver à une entente. J'ajoutais que, dans ces conditions, j'estimais qu'il convenait de profiter de ces dispositions et de principes de la réunion envisagée par le Gouvernement d'Ankara.

Avant de demander au Gouvernement d'Ankara une réponse définitive, il y avait grand intérêt à se prêter aux pourparlers préparatoires qu'il avait avec Messieurs Kemal, dont la présence serait très probable et ces conférences avaient lieu à l'heure, et faire un pas décisif à la cause de la paix.

Ces conversations pourraient éclairer le Gouvernement d'Ankara sur certains points qu'il paraît ne pas avoir exactement compris ou qui ne sont pas visés dans les conditions générales de la paix, et ne lui laisseraient également aucun doute sur les sentiments et les intentions véritables des Alliés à son égard. Elles devraient, d'ailleurs, avoir comme conclusion logique une réponse définitive du Gouvernement d'Ankara, en ce qui concerne les propositions de paix.

Les entretiens avec les représentants du Gouvernement d'Ankara présenteraient encore un autre avantage. En prolongeant la période des négociations, ils rendraient plus difficile, pour des peuples fatigués par la guerre, la reprise des hostilités. Par contre, une mise en demeure immédiate adressée au Gouvernement d'Ankara pourrait fournir aux éléments extrêmes de l'Assemblée nationale un prétexte pour réclamer et joindre aux yeux des populations une reprise de la lutte. Le Gouvernement français ne saurait, pour sa part, assumer la responsabilité d'avoir, par une attitude qui

paraissait peu conciliante, laussé échapper une occasion de ramener la paix en Orient.

Le Gouvernement de la République serait reconnaissant au Gouvernement britannique de lui faire savoir s'il est disposé à accepter la procédure ci-dessus indiquée, qui lui semble la plus favorable au rétablissement de la paix—principal objet des Gouvernements alliés.

Veuillez agréer, Sir,
P. BONCART.

E 4694 5 44)

No. 108

Sir H. Humbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston—(Received May 8)

(No. 309.)

HIS Majesty's representative at Constantinople presents his compliments to His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and has the honour to transmit herewith copy of the reply of the Sublime Porte to the Allied proposals for peace.

Constantinople April 30, 1922

Enclosure in No. 108

Excellency to Sir H. Humbold

LA Sublime Porte exprime sa gratitude aux Gouvernements français, de Grande-Bretagne et d'Italie pour le désir qu'ils manifestent de donner satisfaction au Gouvernement impérial ottoman en avançant la date de l'évacuation des régions occupées. Elle puise dans cette déclaration la conviction que la volonté des Puissances alliées est de faire cesser sans retard les atrocités commises par les turcs, atrocités dont les Puissances ont acquis la certitude par les rapports tant des délégués de la Croix Rouge que de leurs propres délégués chargés de faire les enquêtes nécessaires. En demandant l'évacuation, qui doit assurer la fin de telles atrocités et d'une situation contraire au droit des gens, le Gouvernement impérial ne peut donc pas avoir le sentiment de solliciter une faveur pour laquelle une compensation soit due. Sa requête, étant strictement conforme aux principes d'humanité les plus universellement reconnus, il peut dès lors avoir confiance dans l'aveu que les Puissances alliées voudront bien faire, après nouvel examen, à sa demande d'évacuation prompte des régions occupées par un mandataire qui paraît être certainement sorti des limites de son mandat.

La confiance de la Sublime Porte dans sa demande d'évacuation est d'autant plus justifiée qu'elle est prouvée, conformément au désir exprimé par les Puissances alliées dans sa note du 12 avril, à accepter dans leur ensemble les conditions de paix proposées le 26 mars "sous réserve de la discussion des points particuliers."

La Sublime Porte, en effet, accède au premier principe sur lequel les Puissances alliées déclarent fonder leurs propositions du 26 mars, le rétablissement d'une paix équitable entre la Turquie et la Grèce en n'imposant à aucune d'elles les conditions qui suivraient une défaite. Lors de la discussion des propositions, elle a montré que la juste application de ce premier principe ne peut pas imposer à la Turquie une nouvelle amputation territoriale par la cession d'une partie de la Thrace orientale.

Le Gouvernement impérial exprime sa reconnaissance aux Puissances alliées pour le second principe sur lequel elles ont voulu fonder leurs propositions du 26 mars, le rétablissement de la nation et de la puissance turques dans les territoires qui peuvent être considérés comme leur appartenant, avec Constantinople pour centre, et de façon à permettre à la Turquie de "repréparer une existence nationale vigoureuse et indépendante."

Cependant dans l'appréciation juste et éclairée des Puissances alliées, la Sublime Porte est persuadée que dans la discussion de l'application de ce principe elle n'aura pas de peine à démontrer que la cession d'une portion quelconque de la Thrace orientale au mépris du principe des nationalités et du droit de sécurité de l'Etat ottoman, serait en opposition absolue avec le principe pose, auquel la Turquie ne croit pas pouvoir renoncer. Toutes les questions relatives aux finances de l'Empire ottoman, à son organisation judiciaire, à ses forces de terre et de mer, aux réparations et indemnités, sont étroitement liées à celles de la reconstitution d'une Turquie vigoureuse

et indépendante. La discussion de tous ces cas particuliers ne peut pas être abordée ici et reste réservée pour la conférence proposée par les Puissances alliées.

Le troisième principe sur lequel les Puissances alliées déclarent vouloir fonder leurs propositions de paix est la garantie pour les musulmans du régime le plus équitable et le maintien de l'autorité, tant ecclésiastique que religieuse, de Sa Majesté impériale le Sultan.

La Sublime Porte est particulièrement heureuse de l'affirmation solennelle de ce grand principe, qui doit assurer aux musulmans le maintien de titres et prérogatives séculaires, l'application d'un régime d'égalité et le respect, vis-à-vis d'eux aussi, des règles fondamentales proclamées par les Puissances alliées dans le Pacte mondial de la Société des Nations. Rien ne pouvait lui donner plus de confiance sur les résultats qu'elle peut attendre d'un examen impartial, éclairé et désintéressé des observateurs, qu'elle aura l'honneur de soumettre à la conférence pour assurer la réalisation de ce principe.

Le quatrième principe indiqué dans les propositions du 26 mars est la nécessité d'une compensation à donner à la Grèce "pour les grands services qu'elle a rendus pendant la guerre pour la cause des Alliés."

Quelle que soit l'étendue des sacrifices que la Grèce aurait consentis en faveur des Alliés, la Sublime Porte pense que, si la justice veut que ces sacrifices soient récompensés, cette même justice ne saurait exiger que ce soit au détriment de l'intégrité territoriale de la Turquie, que la Grèce a attaquée postérieurement à l'armistice de 1918.

Le cinquième principe affirmé par les Puissances alliées, à la base de leurs propositions du 26 mars, est la nécessité de mettre le peuple turc et le peuple grec, "dans les régions où ils sont en contact comme dans celles où leurs populations sont mélangées, en mesure de vivre à l'avenir dans des conditions de confiance réciproque et de dignité."

Le Gouvernement impérial ne peut que souscrire avec empressement à ce principe,

aux Puissances alliées à la Conférence de la Paix, sa plus sincère et loyale collaboration à l'accomplissement de cette condition essentielle d'une paix solide et durable qui n'est pas une menace à son droit de conservation.

La protection des minorités forme le sixième principe mis par les Puissances alliées à la base de leurs propositions.

La Sublime Porte adhère complètement à ce principe, qui doit assurer à chacun sa liberté de conscience et le respect de sa dignité humaine. La Turquie l'admet pour son territoire et le considère comme un devoir général et réciproque des Etats. Dans la discussion des moyens propres à assurer cette protection, le Gouvernement impérial ne crée des fermentes de troubles ou de dissidences. La protection des minorités ne doit pas être une incitation à la révolte. Elle ne doit pas faire négliger la protection due aux majorités contre les fauteurs de désordre et de guerres civiles. Elle ne doit pas dégénérer en une tyrannie exercée par une minorité contre la majorité, majorité sans laquelle aucune organisation sociale ne peut se développer dans l'ordre et dans la paix.

La nécessité de "prévenir le retour d'un conflit armé entre la nation turque et les Puissances européennes avec lesquelles elle a été récemment en guerre" est le septième principe sur lequel les Puissances alliées ont voulu fonder leurs propositions. En est déduit la démilitarisation de certaines zones et l'institution d'une commission internationale chargée de la surveillance des Détroits.

La Sublime Porte admet soit le principe de la démilitarisation des zones strictement définies, soit le principe de la démilitarisation des zones plus étendues, et leur ouverture aux navires de toutes les nations sous des garanties internationales. Mais les mesures prévues paraissent dépasser le but proposé sans, d'ailleurs, assurer la sécurité de Constantinople.

Libéral que le Gouvernement impérial est prêt à discuter la façon la plus complète et la plus sûre la liberté de passage des navires des Puissances maritimes sur un pied de parfaite égalité, ainsi que la sécurité des Puissances maritimes.

Dans l'examen en commun des conditions de paix, examen proposé par les Puissances alliées dans leur communication du 26 mars, la Sublime Porte peut donner l'assurance aux Puissances alliées qu'elle n'apportera aucun parti pris. Avec les gouvernements des Puissances alliées, elle a le souci de ne rien demander qui puisse heurter le jugement éclairé du monde civilisé. Dans le ferme désir d'instaurer avec les Puissances alliées un régime de paix durable, elle acceptera tout ce que la justice commande.

En conséquence, le Gouvernement impérial à l'honneur de prier les Puissances alliées de vouloir bien lui faire connaître, le plus tôt possible, la date et le lieu de réunion de la conférence afin qu'il puisse désigner et y envoyer ses délégués.

A. 17/11 T

Sublime Porte, le 29 avril 1922

E 4756 3873 44]

No. 107

Mr. Hodgson to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 8.)

No. 200. Secret.)

My Lord,

Moscow, May 1, 1922.

IN my telegram No. 95 of to-day's date I reported that Ali Fouad Pasha, Ambassador of Angora in Moscow, has asked for his passport as the result of a conflict which had arisen with the Soviet Government out of the discovery in the apartments of an officer attached to the Embassy of certain correspondence of an incriminating character.

What the nature of this correspondence was I am unable to state definitely. According to one informant—a Russian officer employed in the Commissariat for War—it was in the form of orders for the guidance of an officer in the Russian army of the Caucasus. According to information from another source it consisted of documents relating to mobilisation in Russia.

It would seem that the Turkish officer in whose apartments the correspondence was found was sharing accommodation with a Russian officer, and that a perquisition was made on the premises by the orders of the Soviet Government. As a result of the perquisition the Turkish officer was released, but his release was, however, made subject to his being expelled from the country.

Ali Fouad Pasha has protested against this violation of the diplomatic privileges of the Embassy, and demanded the unconditional release of the Turkish officer. He has also demanded the unconditional release of the Russian officer who was arrested on the same pretext. He has also demanded the unconditional release of the Russian officer who was arrested on the same pretext.

This incident is the culminating point of a series of misunderstandings between Moscow and Angora. It would even appear that the Angoran Ambassador has been preparing for some time for an eventual rupture, for he has been cutting down his domestic staff, replacing the Russians by Tartars, and has countermanded furniture which he had ordered for his house. The curtailment of expenditure is, on the other hand, attributed by some to the cessation of the subsidy which, it is said, he has received from the Soviet Government.

Signs of tension between the two Governments first became apparent at the time of the signature of the Kars Treaty (14th October, 1921). The Angora Government has since then maintained the view that, as the three Transcaucasian Republics were independent, the Kars Treaty was a violation of their rights. It has also maintained the view that the Kars Treaty was a violation of their rights.

The signature of the Franco-Angoran Treaty was the second cause of variation. I am not acquainted with the details of the discussion which ensued, but it was terminated by a note published in the Bolshevik press on the 26th November last, in which Ali Fouad Pasha was accused of having agreed to a treaty which would have been a violation of the spirit of the Russo-Turkish Treaty of Friendship.

The protestations of sincerity in which Ali Fouad abounded on this occasion did not prevent the Anglo-Turkish relations from becoming more strained. The Anglo-Turkish relations have since then become more strained. The Anglo-Turkish relations have since then become more strained.

A further incident occurred, as I am informed, some two months ago. A man of the name of Sidi Choud, an Angora courier, was arrested by the Bolsheviks while he was carrying a letter from the Angora Government to Enver Pasha. This led to a violent discussion between Chicherin and Ali Fouad, in the course of which the former reminded the Ambassador that the extermination of the Turkish Communist delegation at Trebizond and stated that, in the opinion of the Bolsheviks, the Angora Government was no less obnoxious than any other.

Whether his protest is sincere is doubtful, for there are indications that the antagonism between the two parties is not so deep as Ali Fouad's expression of hostility would indicate.

Ali Fouad has never attempted to conceal his dislike for Communism and his openly expressed contempt for the Bolshevik administration. In the course of conversation he has spoken to me of his surprise that Western Europe should have dealings with the Moscow Government. He found it reasonable that the Turks, being an Eastern people, should establish relations with the Bolsheviks, but could not believe that the Anglo-Turkish relations could find anything in common with them.

I have, &c.

R M HODGSON

E 4698 2233 44]

No. 108

Sir H. Bunsford to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 8.)

(No. 401.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 1, 1922.

ACCORDING to recent reports from Istanbul, Fahreddin Pasha left that place on the 28th April for the Caucasus. It is stated to have been accompanied by Sami Mur Bey and by Mehmed Effendi, Counsellor of the Afghan Embassy at Ankara.

Through Istanbul he took up the post of representative in Bokhara, accompanied by Husein Fahreddin Bey.

3. Husein Fahreddin Bey is also reported to be about to leave, if he has not already left, for Turkestan on a mission of investigation.

4. Fahreddin Pasha is one of the deportees repatriated last year from Malta. He will be remembered as having held out at Medina for some time after the Turkish evacuation of the city.

5. Husein Fahreddin Bey is a well-known figure in the Turkish world, and has been recommended to the Moslems of Central Asia.

6. Husein Fahreddin Bey was at one time a member of the Angora Cabinet, but resigned last autumn when there were signs of disunion in the Angora Government.

7. It is hardly necessary to draw your Lordship's attention to the significance of these efforts to realise in practice the Kemalist ideal of forming the Moslem States of Asia into a block under hegemony. The following passage from a speech delivered by Husein Fahreddin Bey in a newspaper of that place on the 10th April, is, however, worth reproducing:—

"We Orientals divide the world into two parts, which are separated by a line commencing at the Baltic Sea and extending to the Indian Ocean. The Western nations where their interests lie. If a comparison is made between what we lost during the war and what we have gained since the armistice, it will readily be understood that we have reaped great advantages. The Islamic world is becoming more and more active, and there is no doubt that all our claims will be acknowledged and fulfilled."

[8975]

292

История формирования

No. 109

at the situation from the point of view of for
of a "Western orientation" respectively. Just now those who favour the Russian

13. *Journal of Communication*

No 110

2. The programme of the National Defence Committee opens up a disquieting prospect for the future of Asia Minor. Sir Harry Lamb considers that everything depends on complete solidarity amongst the three Allied Powers. He is of opinion that if the Greek Government were convinced that the Allies were agreed as to the evacuation of Asia Minor, Athens would swallow the evacuation, the army would obey orders and the National Defence Committee would be satisfied. Major J. Lamb, who was in the Greek army, issued disciplinary orders to evacuate, even if it knew that the orders were meant to be obeyed.

3. The situation in Asia Minor has, I think, recently altered to the advantage of the Greeks. The latter have acquired the wherewithal to continue the campaign, and they know that the rich Greek communities abroad are ready to come forward with funds to help the Mikrasian movement. I am informed that the occupation of the Sokia district was effected very smoothly, and that it has considerably encouraged the Greeks.

4. The situation in Asia Minor has, I think, recently altered to the advantage of the Greeks. The latter have acquired the wherewithal to continue the campaign, and they know that the rich Greek communities abroad are ready to come forward with funds to help the Mikrasian movement. I am informed that the occupation of the Sokia district was effected very smoothly, and that it has considerably encouraged the Greeks.

Government, whilst returning irritating and evasive replies to the Allied notes, is careful not to break off negotiations. The Nationalists are closely watching proceedings at Geneva, and, should *de jure* recognition of Soviet Russia emerge from the Geneva Conference, the relations between Soviet Russia and Angora may well be modified to the disadvantage of the Nationalists.

I have, &c
HORACE RUMBOLD.
High Commissioner.

Enclosure in No. 110.

Memorandum by Mr. Hale.

5. The situation in Asia Minor has, I think, recently altered to the advantage of the Greeks. The latter have acquired the wherewithal to continue the campaign, and they know that the rich Greek communities abroad are ready to come forward with funds to help the Mikrasian movement. I am informed that the occupation of the Sokia district was effected very smoothly, and that it has considerably encouraged the Greeks.

6. The movement is primarily Mikrasian as distinct from Hellenic; its supporters are drawn from Asia Minor and the islands, its policy implies defiance as much of the Athens Government as of the Allies, although it is evident that the committee relies on the connivance of the Greek Government in the initial stages of its action. Nevertheless the committee has come to the conclusion that a Hellenic occupation does not afford a satisfactory solution of the problem. First of all they are of opinion that they, as Mikrasians, will enlist the sympathies of certain classes of (old) Turks, who would, however, just prefer Kemalists to a foreign invader, and secondly, because they themselves are disinclined to submit to a Hellenic administration, which is apt to subordinate local welfare to the embellishment of Athens. It is a long standing complaint of the islands and the "redeemed" provinces that their revenues are never devoted to schemes of local development, and that the administration is entrusted to

7. If the Greek administration is unwelcome to the Christian population of Asia Minor a Kemalist administration is unthinkable. The triumphant return to Smyrna of a Turkish Nationalist Government, conscious of having circumvented and humiliated a combination of great European Powers, could not fail to be intolerable; and the immediate and inevitable consequence of a pan-Turk policy, applied by a Turkish Government, would be the displacement of the Christian population. It is indeed, not improbable that even Europeans would experience great difficulty in

8. Legitimate apprehensions of Kemalist misgovernment, on the one hand, and the desire to prevent the other, are not unnatural that the National Defence Committee is not disposed to be content with paper guarantees.

9. M. Pavlidis made no excursions into academic questions as to the hereditary

rights of the Greeks or the moral responsibilities of European Governments; the National Defence Committee base their organisation on the foundations of the crudest human necessity. Hellenic evacuation and consequent Kemalist occupation under whatever guarantees mean financial ruin and grave personal danger to the Christian population, the only remedy is armed resistance, with or without the assistance of

10. The territory it is proposed to hold would fall within a line through Panderma, Afshelur, Ortakja, south of the Meander Valley to Scala Nova. It is militarily far more compact and defensible than the present occupied area, and is roughly the ground General Nider proposed to hold with 80,000 men.

11. contingents: 35,000 Mikrasians, 25,000 Cretans and 10,000 islanders at present serving in the army; 10,000 gendarmes (mainly Mikrasian), and an estimated 20,000 men to be raised by a careful "combing out" of Smyrna. This would furnish between 19 and 32 years of age, of whom more than half have seen long service, would be offered by 3,400 officers who have signed a protocol pledging themselves not to leave Smyrna.

12. In addition to these troops a reserve contingent, estimated at 25,000 strong, has been formed. M. Pavlidis quoted the cases of Yozla, which furnished 2,560 men, Magnesia with 3,000, Adramytti with 800 and a small township like Badia which has given the surprisingly large number of 308. These men are already undergoing military training.

13. The Armenian community has also promised a division.

14. The funds necessary for keeping this force on a war footing will be raised in the following manner:—

- (a.) By doubling the Turkish element with an exemption tax of £ T 600—approximately 20%—a resource methodically exploited by the Turk.
- (b.) By doubling the taxes at present collected by the Dette publique. Of the 12½ per cent. now collected, 8 per cent. is remitted to Constantinople and the Turkish Government retained 4½. 25 per cent. would now be collected.
- (c.) By applying certain "luxury" taxes: This is expected to yield a far less important amount.

The National Defence Committee would be careful not to interfere with the custom houses as being certain to raise a storm of protest.

15. Contributions from Greek communities abroad are also estimated to provide a large lump sum. Constantinople has offered £ T. 20,000,000 and the United States 10,000,000 dollars. This would be

16. The National Defence Committee is not inclined to entrust the command to General Papoulas, who is a puppet of King Constantine and has been blowing hot and cold since his declaration a few weeks ago. A leader should not, however, be hard to find, and many more capable and popular generals than Papoulas are available.

17. It is apparent that this scheme imposes a heavy burden on an already hard driven population. The resources of the inhabitants of the area to be defended. The National Defence Committee are the first to admit this but argue with great point that the only life under an unrestrained Kemalist administration being out of the question. They are themselves fully convinced that the people are with them.

18. In spite of all official warnings to the contrary, the National Defence Committee is convinced that His Majesty's Government is with them in spirit, and will prevent a blockade of Smyrna, the danger of which they admit is their apprehension. M. Pavlidis pointed out that the autonomy of this district would facilitate a British administration of the Straits, and concluded that the British would not be likely to intervene. The committee appears to count largely on the intervention of M. Venizelos who is expected very shortly in London.

Smyrna, April 27, 1922.

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received May 8.)

No. 410. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 1, 1922.

IN amplification of my telegram No. 236 of to-day's date, I have the honour to report that on receipt of your Lordship's telegram No. 186 I called on the Italian High Commissioner. I informed Marquis Garroni of the communication which the Italian Ambassador in London had made to your Lordship, and of the view which you took of the agreement entered into between the Turkish Government and the Italian High Commissioner here.

2. The Italian High Commissioner was visibly disturbed by this communication. Before giving me an account of the transaction in question and of its history, he was entirely ignorant of it and that the Italian Government had not promised any return whatever for the economic advantages promised to it by the Turkish Government.

3. The Italian High Commissioner then went on to say that as far back as Count and the Turkish Government with a view to securing railway, mining and other concessions for Italy in the Adalia district. These pourparlers had dragged on until

Government expressing the readiness of that Government to grant Italian firms, formed with Italian capital, the right to "study" railway concessions, &c., in the Adalia district. Marquis Garroni laid great stress on the word "study." He asked that if the firms in question did not avail themselves of the right within a specified period the right would lapse. Moreover, it was made clear that the present Turkish Cabinet could not bind its successor, and that, if a succeeding Turkish Cabinet disapproved of the concessions now granted to Italy, it would be at liberty to annul those

agreement which Count D'Arco had made with the Nationalists in London of the March conference next year, and which had been subsequently repudiated by the Ankara Government. He said that that agreement had features which were not acceptable from his point of view. He went on to say that he did not consider that M. Dehner had been very successful at the recent conference in Paris in connection with the draft article regarding concessions. He maintained that it would be difficult to uphold this article in the face, for instance, of an eventual American demand for concessions in Asia Minor. When, therefore, the Turkish Government had signified its willingness to address him the recent note promising concessions to Italian firms in the Adalia district, he did not see why he should reject the proposal. The Italian

6. On my remarking that the action of the Turkish Government could not have been spontaneous, Marquis Garroni admitted that he had intimated to that Government that it was time that the long drawn-out pourparlers should terminate in

me that the Turkish Government should make even a nominal offer for concessions in Italy during the negotiations for a Near Eastern settlement, and that the Turkish Government might

me that the Turkish Government should make even a nominal offer for concessions in Italy during the negotiations for a Near Eastern settlement, and that the Turkish Government might

me that the Turkish Government should make even a nominal offer for concessions in Italy during the negotiations for a Near Eastern settlement, and that the Turkish Government might

Central and Ankara Governments in this matter. The latter would not accept any action on the part of the Central Government which it would consider an unwarrantable interference.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,

High Commissioner

May 2, 1922

P.S.—The Italian High Commissioner called on me this morning and read to me the originals of the notes exchanged between the Turkish Government and himself, regarding the agreement for the grant of concessions to Italian firms in the Adalia district. I had certainly understood from my Italian colleague, from the conversation reported in the body of this despatch, that there had been merely a note from the Turkish Government. Marquis Garroni also read me the preamble of the agreement, but not the agreement itself, which, he said, was only destined to come into force after the ratification of peace with Turkey. The note which he read me from the Turkish Government corresponds to the verbal account he had already given me. He again laid stress on the necessity for providing the Italian Government with some document which would enable it, in case of necessity, to show that Italy had got something out of the war with Turkey.

H. R.

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received May 8.)

(N
(S)

Constantinople, May 2, 1922

THE Minister for Foreign Affairs, who had been unable to deliver to me in person on April the reply of the Turkish Government to the note of the Allies of the 12th ultimo, called to-day to enquire what I thought of that reply.

I said that whilst the Turkish Government stated that it was ready to accept the body of the peace conditions, subject to the discussion of particular points, it had succeeded in discussing each one of the principles laid down in the preamble to the Paris Peace Treaty. I said that practically every particular point was inconsistent with those principles. In fact the Turkish Government had given with one hand and taken away with the other. I recognised that the answer of the Turkish Government was courteous in form, whereas that of Ankara was rude. Both answers were, however, unsatisfactory.

3. Izzet Pasha said that it had not been possible for the Constantinople Government to confine itself to the statement that it accepted the body of the peace conditions. A statement would have laid it open to a charge of treachery. I said that it had been clear to me that in framing its reply to the Allied note of the 12th April, the Constantinople Government had been very careful. Izzet Pasha admitted this readily. We then discussed certain passages of the note, in particular those referring to Eastern Thrace and the Straits. I said that I wished to clear away any misconception there might be in the mind of the Turkish Government with regard to the main lines of the proposed peace settlement. His Majesty's Government did not, I was sure, intend to permit of any considerable modifications of the main points of the settlement, though there might be modifications of detail. Thus, for instance, the answer of the Constantinople Government took exception to the cession of any portion of Eastern Thrace, but there was no intention of handing Adrianople back to Turkey.

4. As regards the Straits, we did not intend to allow Turkey to have both shores of the Dardanelles. Izzet Pasha said that the recovery of the northern shore of the Straits had almost become a question of honour for Turkey. I replied that, with the memory of the Gallipoli campaign fresh in our minds, it was not only a question of honour but one of safety for the Allies that Turkey should never again be able to close the Straits. Izzet Pasha said that there could be no question of this. The Turks were ready to agree to any measures necessary for the freedom of navigation of the Straits. I replied that I could not agree. The Gallipoli Peninsula was to be occupied by an inter-Allied force and the whole of Eastern Thrace was to be

...and. What harm could the Greeks do? I added that events changed very rapidly in present times. If and when peace was concluded, the present duality in the Government of Turkey would presumably disappear, and Nationalist officials would come to Constantinople. The spirit prevailing at Angora was not very reassuring, the Nationalists were xenophobe and, if the Gallipoli Peninsula were restored to Turkey, I thought it would be favourable to them, try to make trouble for us in connection with the Straits.

5. Izzet Pasha then said that he was sure that it would be possible to come to a settlement with Turkey if once the conference met and the Allies conceded to Turkey certain vital matters. Although I asked him what these were, he did not specify what he meant with any precision. I said that the assembly of a conference depended mainly on the Allies, and that the removal of the replies hitherto received from Angora was not

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,

High Commissioner.

E 4755 5 44

No. 113

Sir H. Graham to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received May 2.)

(No. 3301)

My Lord,

I RECEIVED your Lordship's telegram No. 130 of the 28th inst. in connection with one of the Turkish-Italian Agreement signed in Constantinople, with regret rather than surprise, although the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs had given me no indication whatsoever at two interviews which I had with him shortly before he left for Genoa that anything of the kind was in the air. But I have formed the conviction that the question of the tripartite agreement, as bearing on the vital necessity of raw materials for the Allies, is one which they appear to regard it as the only tangible advantage which Italy has secured from the agreement, and which it offers them.

In the absence of Signor Facta, Signor Schanzer and the Secretary-General of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Genoa and Rapallo, there has been no one in Rome with whom I could usefully discuss the matter, but last night I received an urgent message from Signor Contarini on the question of the agreement.

I found Signor Contarini greatly perturbed over the articles which had appeared in the Commons and the comments which the Italian papers were offering. He expressed his conversation by stating that in his personal opinion the Italian Government had made a serious mistake in signing this agreement without first keeping His Majesty's Government fully informed. The whole matter had been put through during his absence at Rapallo: he had known nothing about it and had not been consulted. Otherwise he would certainly have advised against the step. I said that this was interesting, but that presumably Signor Schanzer had authorized the signature. Signor Contarini replied that such was the case but that Signor Schanzer had his hands so full at Genoa that he had not attached sufficient importance to the matter, and had, moreover, considered himself covered by the conversation on the subject of the Italian negotiations with Turkey which he had had with your Lordship in Paris. While

Contarini urged that far too much importance had been attached by the press to the incident. I had brought with me a copy of your Lordship's note of the 27th April to

this to Signor Contarini to read saying that it would show the views of His Majesty's Government. He had not yet received the document from Chevalier de Martino, and I

been telephoning to him this morning saying that the whole affair was a terrible

Signor Contarini said that he had already admitted that the signature of the agreement without our knowledge had been a great mistake. He must also confirm

that he agreed with your Lordship's view that the effect went it did not much matter whether the agreement was signed at Constantinople or at Angora. He also

...the exact terms. He would, however, ... the new agreement, equally with ... the Government which signed it, that is to say, the existing Government at Constantinople, would be bound by it. Izzet Pasha's draft did not appear to me to be more than that the Turkish Government undertook to give their favour de commerce to applications for concessions in the area secured to Italy under the tripartite agreement for Italian firms recommended by the Italian Government. Most of the concessions were of the Hercules mines and of certain railway projects. The Italian Ambassador at Constantinople had reported the renewal of the Turkish offer, though in a slightly attenuated form, and had recommended that he should be authorized to sign the agreement. Signor Contarini showed me the draft of Signor Schanzer's reply, authorizing the Ambassador to sign it for "what it was worth."

Signor Contarini said that, as I must see, the agreement was practically valueless. It only bound the Constantinople Government and was couched in terms of extreme vagueness. If the Italian Government had made a mistake in their methods, His Majesty's Government were mistaken in substance, for we were attaching an altogether undue importance to the incident. He regretted that Signor Schanzer had said nothing to me about the negotiations; he himself could not have done so, as he had not been kept informed, but it was extremely painful to Signor Schanzer to feel that at a moment when he was daily shouldering to shoulder with Mr. Lloyd George at Genoa and was acting in the closest co-operation with him, the Italian Government should be accused of going behind our backs and of action which amounted to treachery.

I said that I need not recapitulate the views of His Majesty's Government on the subject, as they were clearly expressed in the note from your Lordship to Chevalier de Martino, which he had just read. Upon myself personally the incident had created a bad impression. I knew that on a previous occasion Count Sforza, when Foreign Minister, had earned our resentment by negotiating a separate agreement with the Turks, but during my association with the Marquis della Turbie the attitude of the Italian Government both on the questions of relations with Afghanistan and of the Turkish Mission to Angora had been frank and loyal and had won the approval of His Majesty's Government. It looked as if Signor Schanzer desired to revert to the earlier methods. Signor Contarini strongly decried. I added that in one respect I could cordially agree with him and that was that the present agreement appeared to have no value whatever. Why, then, had the Italian Government thought it worth while to earn our distrust and to prejudice the solidarity of the Allies in their united front to Turkey for advantages of so illusory a character? It further appeared to me incredible that the Turks should offer concessions without some *quid pro quo* and it looked as if something was still being kept back.

Signor Contarini said that the whole affair was due to Italian anxiety to reap the benefits of the tripartite agreement. The Italian Government had been well satisfied with the agreement, but it was, however, that this would not ensure to them the advantages of the agreement. It was a matter on which Italian public opinion was acutely sensitive and alive, and the Italian

Government had desired to show that they were not neglecting the question, but were doing all they could. It was, indeed, a move made for internal political reasons, although in his own opinion the agreement was practically valueless. In the course of the following reason. It was to be understood, although no actual undertaking had been given, that as under the new agreement the Italians would obtain direct from the Turks all the economic and commercial advantages figuring under the tripartite agreement, they would therefore be able to drop the latter and not to insist upon their claims under it. Such an inducement did not appear to me convincing, but when Turks are engaged in negotiations, and the same may be said of Italians, it is always easy.

Finally, I have taken to end of which the British Hoare Naurse's despatch No. 2, Secret, of the 24th April, on the present situation in Asia Minor which I have already told of truth, to place the Italian

R. GRAHAM

E 4821/27 44]

No 114

Mr. Lindley to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 2.)

No. 202,

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of Hoare Naurse's despatch No. 2, Secret, of the 24th April, on the present situation in Asia Minor.

I have, &c.
F. O. LINDLEY.

Enclosure in No. 114.

Colonel Hoare Naurse to Mr. Lindley

(Secret)

Sir,

Athens, April 24 1922

I HAVE the honour to submit some remarks on the present military situation which are based chiefly on conversations with General Pallis, Chief of the Staff of the Greek Army of Asia Minor, who has been in Athens on leave during the last three weeks.

1. The Military Situation of the Army in Asia Minor.

General Pallis said the moral generally is still high. When the Greek troops first arrived at their present line from the River Sakaria they were annoyed and depressed to find that not only foreign nations, but even their compatriots in Athens, regarded their moral. But hard work and its visible results in security and shelter kept them going, and the evidence, given by the battle of Afium Karahissar in October, of their leaders and themselves. He recognised that there had been danger of a deterioration of discipline, and consequently of moral, by the reawakening of political differences during the summer of the winter, but he claimed that the commanders and staffs had minimised the evil effects by allowing political discussions within limited bounds, while sternly repressing propaganda.

General Pallis does not see the means of movement and supply would be the best way to deal with the situation.

E 4670 900 44]

No 113a

Lord Hardinge to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 8.)

My Lord,

Paris, May 6, 1922

I HAVE the honour to inform your Lordship, with reference to your Lordship's despatch No. 240 of the 1st April regarding the French protestations over the Catholic

Near East, that I received a visit from the Italian Ambassador today, who stated that he had been instructed to address a note to the French Government on the subject of your Lordship's despatch under reference (of which he had a copy), and that he intended to carry out those instructions without delay.

Count Stora asked therefore that he might be given a copy of the despatch sent to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in accordance with your Lordship's instructions, and I am accordingly providing him herewith with one.

I have, &c.
HARDINGE OF PENNURS.

expose the Greek communications to any additional risk in that direction, and that he thought General Papoulas would avoid putting troops into the valley, which was full of malaria. As regards the valley, I agree with his view; but I think anxiety to isolate Suda Nuova from Kemalist bands and influence may induce General Papoulas to complete his column to the sea at Cape Papas.

6. The Combat at Saran

An unofficial telegram from Smyrna to the Greek press describes a combat which took place at Saran, south-west of Afium Karahissar, on the 14th April as a severe Turkish defeat, and mentions 400 Turkish corpses left on the battlefield. The telegram has been "communicated." General Pallis had a report on this Staff in Asia Minor who was

resolution than the Greeks thought it was only a light one which were in the line. The best light but he has shown him to fit himself

I have, &c.
E. S. HOARE NAIKNE, (Colonel)

E 4824 5 44]

No 115

Mr. Landley to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 9.)

(No. 219)

My Lord,

Athens, April 29, 1922

I HAVE the honour to report that I called to-day on the Greek Prime Minister, who returned three days ago from Genoa. M. Gounaris stated that he had had

Athens. M. Gounaris replied that the delegation had come to offer the services of the Asia Minor Greeks to the Greek authorities. They disclaimed any intention of taking at the Greek forces could be by the better organisation of the Greek forces to them, and had told them to evacuate. Evacuation

with the delegation than he admitted to me, and represented evacuation as being an unlikely development. In order to illustrate the attitude of the press on this subject, I cannot do better than transmit to your Lordship a French summary of the articles which appeared yesterday in the principal Athens papers.* The same sort of articles appear daily, and I have merely chosen this summary as the latest. It will be observed

* Not printed.

that the Venizelist papers are, on the whole, the most violent against the peace proposals of the Powers.

I regret that, an opportunity of sending despatches safely having arisen suddenly, I have no time to have the summary copied.

I have, &c.
F. O. LANDLEY

E 4853 5 44,

No 116

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Lord Hardinge (Paris)

(No. 1405)

My Lord,

Foreign Office, May 10, 1922

IT is now six weeks since the conference between the Foreign Ministers of France, Italy, and Great Britain separated at Paris after agreeing upon a number of definite proposals for the termination of hostilities between the Greeks and the Turks for the final conclusion of peace between the Allied Powers and Turkey and for the settlement of the most important aspects of the Near Eastern question. These proposals, which it is unnecessary to recapitulate here, were communicated by telegram to the Governments concerned and an early reply was requested. The Greek Government immediately accepted the first suggestion of the Powers, viz. the armistice. No further reply from them has been received. In the case of the Turkish answer the situation has been complicated by the facts (1) that there are two Turkish Governments in existence whose replies had to be received (2) that the replies, though nominally distinct, were compelled by the force of circumstances to be more or less interdependent, the Constantinople Government not being likely or willing to return any answer which would not be in general consonance with the views entertained at Angora (3) that each of these two Governments in true Oriental fashion, welcomed the opportunity either to dispute about the precise meaning of the terms submitted to them or to reopen the entire discussion which it

which had been suggested. It is not necessary for the purposes of the present argument to analyse with any closeness the replies of the Constantinople Government since, as M. Poincaré has remarked, they do not differ sensibly from that of the Angora Turks.

The reply of the latter has assumed a double form. Its first edition was

claim *inter alia* that evacuation of Asia Minor by the Greek troops must be proceeded with as soon as an Armistice had been concluded, and in particular that the evacuation of the advanced strategic position held by the Greeks upon the railway Eskischir-Afium Karahissar must be effected within fifteen days—no regard whatever being paid to the fundamental considerations which underlay the proposal of the Powers, viz. that the Armistice had been proposed in order to allow for the

accepted contained in

tion being subsequently added that Mustapha Kemal would be willing to attend such have full powers to take decisions without reference to their Governments. This communication appeared to His Majesty's Government to raise three questions—

(1) the attitude and policy of the Ankara Government, to be deduced as a whole, (2) the nature of the Conference suggested at Ismid, (3) Ismid as the place of meeting.

His Majesty's Government did not hastily form an opinion upon any of these issues, being anxious to lose no opportunity that might point to an honourable exit from the present deplorable *impasse*, nor did they fail to receive from their High Commissioner at Constantinople full advice upon every one of these points.

This examination and advice rendered it impossible for His Majesty's Government to form any other conclusion than that the Ankara Government definitely refused to accept any of the fundamental conditions underlying the policy of the Allied Powers, that they intended at the suggested Conference to reopen any and every question, and that their reply was in reality only a tactical manoeuvre to drive the Allies into a position where the responsibility for the breakdown of negotiations could be thrown upon the latter.

It is more particularly necessary in this context to examine the proposal for the Conference at Ismid. His Majesty's Government would welcome the opportunity of meeting Mustafa Kemal at a Conference table just as they have welcomed the opportunities recently afforded to them in London of discussing matters with İzzet Pasha and Yusuf Kemal Bey. But a moment's scrutiny will reveal that the meeting as suggested is to be of a very one-sided and compromising character.

It is to be held at Ismid, i.e. in the part of Turkey which is under Nationalist influence. It is not, like the Conference suggested by the Powers, to be a meeting at which their High Commissioners at Constantinople will meet representatives of both Turkish Governments and of the Greek Government in order to discuss with them the conditions of peace. Far from this the High Commissioners are to be summoned to meet the head of the Ankara Government alone. It is clear that the Constantinople Government is not to be admitted, that the Greeks are equally to be excluded, and that the High Commissioners are to be placed in a position where they must either accept the terms submitted to them by Mustafa Kemal, or, having neither the authority nor the willingness to accept them, return to Constantinople with the onus of failure upon their shoulders.

As regards the suggestion of Ismid itself, His Majesty's Government have at different times declared their willingness to agree either to Constantinople or Fréskipo or Mada, or to any suitable place in Western Europe. But the suggestion of Ismid as the place of meeting for a Conference to which two of the principal

them to surpass the limits of what they could reasonably or properly concede.

In these circumstances I suggested on the 25th April the terms of a draft reply to the Ankara Government which might be sent by the Allied Powers, and in which the principles upon which the Foreign Ministers had agreed at Paris and since, were reaffirmed, and Thessalonica was suggested as the most convenient place of meeting.

The reply of the Italian Government to this proposal has not yet been received, although I learn by telegram from Constantinople that it has the approval of the Italian High Commissioner. On the other hand I have received from M. Poincaré an expression of the view of the French Government to the effect that the general tone of the Ankara reply manifests a clear desire to arrive at an understanding, that it is desirable to accept the proposed meeting at Ismid, and that if conversations are opened there it will be more difficult for hostilities to be resumed. He is not willing, therefore, to accept the terms of my proposed reply to the Ankara Note.

It is difficult for His Majesty's Government to believe that in making these proposals the French Government can have fully considered the nature of the situation as I have above explained it. Do they realise that the Ankara Note definitely refuses acceptance of the Paris Peace proposals as a prior and essential condition of evacuation, and thereby, for the second time, rejects the Allied offer? If the Allied Governments are to surrender to the Ankara demand for a preliminary Conference before acceptance of the armistice and peace conditions, why should not a similar demand be made by Athens and by Constantinople, and how could it logically be refused?

Do the French Government really consider it desirable at this juncture to enter a late another stage never contemplated at Paris, and certain to have been rejected once all to himself, certain to have no other result than to postpone the Conference proposed by common consent at Paris, and doomed in all probability to end in a success which would not only be humiliating, but disastrous?

If Mustafa Kemal desires any explanation as to the intentions of the Allies or the meaning of their terms, let him depute any representative whom he pleases to Constantinople, where the High Commissioners will be ready to give him the fullest explanations, or better still let him either propose or acquiesce in the selection of some spot where the Conference, as originally proposed, can be held without further delay.

In inviting the serious attention of the French Government to these considerations, I must stress that the delay in carrying out the Paris proposals is a burden which none of the Allies should be willing to bear. The sands are running out. In the interval that has

elapsed, and the possibility of Greek resistance to the demands of the Allies, becomes daily not more but less favourable. Equally is there a danger, confirmed by all the reports that have been received, of an even closer understanding and more active military co-operation between the Ankara and Soviet Governments—a situation that cannot be any more beneficial to French than to British interests in the Middle East. If the Powers represented at Paris were sincere in their proposals and if they meant

to do so, there can be no excuse for these protracted delays with their attendant perils. Rather should the allied policy be one of adhering to the plan there prepared and making a start from Ankara, Constantinople and Athens alike.

His Majesty's Government would view with profound regret the abandonment of this plan, to which so much labour was devoted, and they are slow to believe that the French Government can have any such intention. It is in this spirit that I am now addressing them in the hope that the common allied action which has here been urged may be resumed, in the general sense of the proposals which I have previously made.

Should this be found impossible, His Majesty's Government will have to deal with the matter in a different and independent way, and the prelude to any such action on the matter that has passed between the Allied Governments and the Governments of Athens, Ankara and Constantinople.

They would greatly prefer, however, that the three Governments should once more unite in the communication of an identical note to the Governments of Athens and Constantinople, intimating that a definite reply to their proposals must now be made, and that there can be no further delay in summoning a Conference of the character agreed upon at Paris.

His Majesty's Government will be grateful if, in view of the urgency of the matter, they may be favoured with an early reply to this communication.

I am, &c.

CURZON OF KEDLESTON

E 4925 5 44]

No 117.

Memorandum by Sir E. Croice.

I SPOKE to the French Ambassador to-day on the subject of M. Poincaré's note of the 1st May, concerning the negotiations for the revision of the Treaty of Sèvres. He had not, I gathered, seen M. Poincaré's note and was in some ways astonished at some of the points in it to which I drew his attention. I reproduced at some length the full line of argument of Lord Curzon's reply in the form of his despatch to Lord Hardinge which is now on the way to Paris. I finally dwelt more particularly on the meeting with the Allied High Commissioners at Ismid, and on the importance of joint action between the Allies in demanding a definite and early reply to the proposals upon between the three Foreign Secretaries at Paris.

Comte de Saint-Aulaire said he was not of course in a position to forecast what view M. Poincaré would take when our note reached him. He himself was disposed altogether to agree with Lord Curzon's objection to the Ismid meeting, at least were to be held under the conditions indicated, and he promised to urge upon M. Poincaré the necessity of reconsidering the matter. On the other hand, he said he shared M. Poincaré's conviction that the one thing to be aimed at now was to get

the Turks to accept the armistice, and he felt sure that the whole object of M. Poincaré's suggestion was to arrive at this provisional solution, being persuaded that once the parties had laid down their arms it would be next to impossible to get them to take up arms again. He added that he was not at all certain that it would not be well worth while to meet the Turks so far as to let the Greek evacuation of Anatolia follow immediately after arriving at an understanding with Ankara on the armistice, and without waiting for the latter's formal acceptance of the general plan of settlement elaborated in London. This would certainly lead to a formal concentration of Greek troops in Anatolia, and although the Allies would not allow the Greeks to give definite effect to such a threat, yet it might well suffice to induce Ankara to show a more reasonable attitude in dealing with Allied conditions for a general settlement.

I evolved that I thought this might prove to be an exceedingly dangerous suggestion which seemed to me to warrant my expectation that, having succeeded in getting rid of the Greeks from Anatolia, he would abate one jot of the Nationalist claims in other unlikely that the Greeks on their part would agree to evacuate before receiving an assurance that the counterpart

The second object might arise in Constantinople in the event, foreboding well Greek concentration en masse at Ankara. In

that, before taking any further steps in the direction of concessions to Mustafa Kemal, the Allies should make a determined effort to bring about a solution on terms which had after so much difficulty and patience been settled between them in Paris.

E. A. C.

Foreign Office, May 11, 1922.

B 4951 & 44.

No. 118.

Signor Schanzer to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received May 13.)

My Lord, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Genoa, May 8, 1922. THE King's Ambassador in London has communicated to me the note which your Excellency addressed to him on the 27th April to protest against the agreement, of an economic character, which has been concluded between the Italian Government and the Turkish Government of Constantinople.

In view of the contents, and of the tone of your Excellency's note, I think it before when I discussed this question at the last meeting of the three Allied Foreign Ministers at Paris last March, in order to show clearly what is the present position of Italy in the Near East, and what are the principles by which the political action of the King's Government must naturally be inspired in order to safeguard, as its duty is, Italian interests, without, however, wishing to injure in any way those of the Allies.

Going back to the first inter Allied agreement regarding the Eastern settlement, France and England recognised in principle that Italy is interested in the maintenance of the balance of power in the Mediterranean, and that, in the event of the total or partial disappearance of Turkey in Asia, she would be entitled to obtain a fair share of the Mediterranean region centring round the Province of Adana. The same article added that the interests of Italy would be equally taken into consideration should the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire be maintained or if any modifications should be introduced in regard to the zones of interest of the Powers. The Treaty of Sèvres, which was the result of the Paris Conference, was laid down, without the participation of Italy, the new settlement which was to be effected

in 1915, in any settlement or modification of the status of the provinces of the Turkish Empire which might be brought about as a consequence of the war. In spite of this, the Treaty of Sèvres of the 10th August, 1920, which had been preceded by the occupation of Smyrna by the Greeks, attributed the city and zone of Smyrna to Greece, thus modifying the position in which the rights of Italy had been recognised by the Treaty of Saint Jean de Maurienne.

In connection with the new Eastern settlement which was established by the Treaty of Sèvres, the so-called Tripartite Agreement was drawn up between the Allies at San Remo. By this agreement, conditions of economic priority for Italian

The guarantees for the practical efficacy of this agreement were not, however, contained in the provisions of the agreement itself (which was nothing more than a negative act by which the Allies mutually disinterested themselves in certain spheres) but in the clauses of the Treaty of Sèvres, which established Allied controls and provided for Allied co-operation in various matters, and, in so far as concessions are concerned, in the financial clauses of that treaty.

Turkish opposition to any diminution, even of a purely economic or financial character, in the exercise of sovereign rights in the territory which might be left to the Ottoman Empire, hardened and took definite shape.

And thus Italy, who had witnessed the gradual disappearance of the advantages which had been guaranteed to her in the Near East on the basis of the recognition of her rights and interests as a great, and as a wholly Mediterranean Power, which had been sanctioned by the Treaty of London of 1915, found herself, on the eve of the Paris Conference of last March not only faced with the necessity, which had for

her full sovereign rights in Anatolia, and with the determined opposition of Turkey to any friendly application of the Tripartite Agreement, but also faced with the possibility that even the financial clauses of the Treaty of Sèvres, which formed the guarantee of that agreement, might have to be profoundly modified in order to secure the Turkish Government to accept a peaceful settlement.

In these circumstances, I thought it opportune to make a special preliminary point, in the discussions regarding the revision of the Treaty of Sèvres, of the absolute necessity for Italy to assure her own interests in Anatolia, and to safeguard in that region, even if it must be in an inadequate measure, that balance of power in

And it is for that reason that I particularly begged the Allies to consider before any other question the manner in which the position of Italy could be set right so that the King's Government should not be put in a position of complete disadvantage, where it would be impossible for it to discuss in a calm and disinterested way the solution of the Eastern problem. The result of my firm insistence was the insertion in the new Treaty of Peace with Turkey a clause by which concessions which might have been given by the Turkish Government should be submitted to the examination of a special commission, so that the interested Governments, and therefore Italy, should at least have had previous warning, in order that they might be able to guarantee in some way their own interests.

Without wishing to diminish the value of the conclusions arrived at by the Paris meeting on this question, the fact remains that the Allied Governments could not have excused themselves in any way from declaring as always valid the obligations

observe that such incredulity is due rather to the untimely press polemics, which could easily have been avoided if the British Government themselves had not com-

I have &c
SCHANZER

19

I have, &c.
P. O. L. SULLY

Colonel Henry Norrie to Mr. Landley.

General Papoulas's categorical statements that neither he nor the army will not continue to support the Government longer than it is necessary to do so, made known to me by General Pallis. The close co-operation between the commander of the army of Asia Minor and the Government is further confirmed by the facts that General Papoulas arrived in Athens from Smyrna yesterday, and at once had a long conversation with the Minister of War, and that an hour later the Council of Ministers held a meeting, which M. Sterghiades attended.

The indications here, then, all point to the co-operation of the army with the Government and against insubordinate action by any large body of troops or important commanders, but, not having seen the army in Asia Minor since June 1921, I cannot estimate the present moral or temper of the troops from personal contact with them.

If my conclusions gathered here are right, the army will leave the responsibility for whatever may happen in Asia Minor to the Government by conforming with its orders. So the question remaining is what orders the Government will give or will find itself strong enough to give. The reassembly of the Chamber the day after to-morrow will probably give some clue to the answer.

I believe that the question whether the Greek Government will try to set up in

employed in the Ministry of War as one of the Minister's personal assistants, spoke to such plan, the Greeks have in the army of Asia Minor the strongest military organisation. I reflect, they cannot ignore the inexorable facts, that the army which failed to achieve decisive victory last year cannot hope even to attempt to force it now unless strongly reinforced, and that Greece has not funds, nor any visible prospect of funds, sufficient to provide for a general mobilisation or for the only other alternative to evacuation—a recent conversation with me.

In the meantime reports, which earn credence by their persistence and uniformity, indicate that deserters and absentee recruits are being vigorously collected; and that both they and considerable reserves of ammunition and of stores are being sent to Asia Minor. This action, however, is a natural precaution in view of the proposed armistice and of the veto on moving men or material after its conclusion.

I have, &c.

E. S. HOARE NAIRNE, Colonel,
Military Attaché

Enclosure 2 in No. 119.

Extract from Athenian Newspapers of April 13th 1922.

THE Press Bureau has communicated the following letter from General Papadimas addressed to the newspapers of Athens:—

"I am indignant to learn that a number of reports have recently been spread by people who bear me a grudge for measures which I have taken concerning them.

"These reports tend to represent me as acting on my own initiative, contrary to the orders of the responsible Government.

"These rumours are being exploited politically by interested persons.

"Consequently, in order to put an end to these malicious efforts, I find myself obliged formally to declare that conscious of my duty, I have not embarked, nor is it possible that I should embark, on any action without the consent or the order of the responsible Government.

"I have clearly explained to the delegations of patriotic organisations who King, the army carries out, and will carry out and obey, the orders of the State.

"PAVLOS LAKS, General,
"Commander of the Army of Asia Minor"

E 4980 19 44,

No. 120

Mr H. Humboldt to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 15.)

(No. 415)

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 3, 1922.

I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of a communication addressed to each of the Allied High Commissioners individually by Yussuf Kemal

Bay, drawing the attention of the Allied Governments to the atrocities stated to have been committed by the Greek authorities and troops in occupied territory. This agent.

2. After reading this communication through, I stated to Hamid Bey that, if the facts as related were true, they were very regrettable. I pointed out, however, that I had received no reports from Smyrna confirming the statement that the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses. On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

On the contrary, such information as I had received from Smyrna pointed to the fact

of the reoccupation of the Sokia district by the Greek forces had been attended by massacres and excesses.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner.

Enclosure in No. 120

Yussuf Kemal Bey to Sir H. Humboldt

Istanbul, le 30 avril 1922.

Le Gouvernement de la grande Assemblée nationale de Turquie se voit obligé d'attirer encore une fois l'attention des Gouvernements français, britannique et italien sur les atrocités commises par les autorités et les troupes helléniques en territoire occupé, atrocités qui se sont multipliées depuis la dernière Conférence de Paris.

En mars dernier, le village de Férendjé, dans le caïus de Trabzon, a été mis à sac par les Grecs, qui ont en même temps assassiné un notable nommé Ahmed Agha et

Dans la boutique de Chamilar près de Smyrne, douze bouchers musulmans furent assassinés, leurs bestiaux enlevés et leurs cadavres abandonnés en pleine rue.

Dans la boutique de Chamilar près de Smyrne, douze bouchers musulmans furent assassinés, leurs bestiaux enlevés et leurs cadavres abandonnés en pleine rue.

Les bandes grecques dépendant des organisations dites nationales commettent journellement sur la population musulmane des atrocités sans nombre et travaillent

provoque par la terreur, l'élément musulman des régions occupées.

Le Comité révolutionnaire arménien Dachnakian a décidé de collaborer à cette œuvre et délégué à Syzyne le Général Toroum, célèbre pour les massacres qu'il perpétra sur la population musulmane de nos provinces orientales, après la retraite des armées russes en 1917.

Cet individu, qui, durant la guerre balkanique, servait comme lieutenant dans l'armée bulgare et provoqua un duel l'illustre écrivain français Pierre Loti pour ses insultes à l'égard de la France, a été condamné à mort par la justice grecque. Il a été exécuté à Salonique.

Le Gouvernement de la grande Assemblée nationale de Turquie veut espérer que les grandes Puissances ne permettraient pas que les crimes commis par les Bachnaks dans nos prisons de l'est, crimes dévotés par tant d'officiers russes et par le général de vieux Harbord qui vouta ses régimes après l'armistice de 1918, se renouvelent de nos jours en Anatolie occidentale.

En attendant que les unités arméniennes entrent en action sur une vaste échelle, des bandes grecques et arméniennes, constituées par les organisations mentionnées et agissant tant par le Patriarcat grecque de Constantinople que par le Gouvernement hellénique l'appellent, continuent leurs forfaits. Le soir du 1^{er} avril dernier, une de ces bandes, de l'effectif d'un bataillon, occupa le quartier musulman de Mousson avec le concours de troupes régulières. Toutes les maisons furent mises à sac, les femmes et les jeunes filles violées et beaucoup d'hommes assassinés. Les mêmes faits se répéteront les jours suivants dans les villages environnants, sous le prétexte de chasser des armes cachées.

La moulin de Méhidie, près de Djiguermou, fut assailli par une de ces bandes
formée de dix hommes, son propriétaire, un riche musulman nommé Ali Kelya
composée de £T 10,000 en billets et de 400 pièces d'or, vu

Suivent, et contre autres, nombre peut de filles immatures furent violées, puis transgressées.

Le 15 avril, le village de Djeviz, au sud de Beyd-Guzi, fut incendié par les Grecs. La région de Souk, à peine évacuée par les Italiens, fut envahie par les Hellènes avant d'avoir été réoccupée par les troupes turques. Dès la matinée du 20 courant, les Grecs entrèrent dans le village de Dikikouy, près de Souk et l'incendièrent. Des bandes montées grecques, se dirigeant de Mouda vers Ipekizanti, avancèrent en poursuivant

leur pillèrent les villages et ne retournèrent en emmenant tout le bétail des paysans, après avoir massacré, sans distinction d'âge ni de sexe, ceux qui n'auraient pas le temps de se sauver. Beaucoup de musulmans poursuivis par ces bandes ne sont parvenus dans le Moudou.

Mind v.
 the pro
 fourteenth
 national
 discount

Ministère des Affaires étrangères du Gouvernement
de la grande Assemblée nationale de Turquie.

No 121

Mr. Lindley to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 15.)

Athens, May 6, 1919
 The Prime Minister has accepted the armistice and to meet the Greeks at a conference has, for the time being, extricated the Prime Minister from his most pressing parliamentary difficulties. He has been able to make a timely public pronouncement regarding his willingness to accept Allied peace proposals on the plea that the Kemal reply has created a new situation. In my telegram No. 445 of the 4th instant I expressed an opinion that the

may be that Government circles are merely elated by their hopes of a more favourable settlement and by the successes they have had in occupying the Unseater via by without difficulty and in securing control of the Ann Minor defence movement, which at the time appeared to be likely to constitute a serious danger to the existing régime.

The doings of the Asia Minor delegates, whose visit to Athens was reported in my telegram No. 166 of the 1st instant have been the subject of numerous articles in the press, and it is significant that, in spite of all three being known Venizelists, they were received on the 3rd instant by King Constantine. It is perhaps more significant that such a violently Venizelist paper as the "Patrie" reports the audience in terms which are sympathetic to the Sovereign.

The above incident is the most striking of several which have occurred lately, national position, and are ready to bury the hatchet as regards the question of the security of the untrodden Greece. This development will not make the Greek Government more easy to deal with, but it should reduce the danger of the Asia Minor Greeks resisting a settlement which that Government have accepted.

In conversation the other day the Ministry for Foreign Affairs referred to the situation as one that could not be allowed to continue indefinitely. If the _____ a settlement, M. Balthazet hinted that the Greek _____ themselves. I have no idea what line any future Greek proposals might take, but they certainly would not include the complete

the present extended position. An easily defensible line might be found in Thrace and the Greeks might then hope to wear down the Kemalists. True that such a development would offer serious dangers to Greece, and the more characteristic organs of the press have, during the last few days, revived the idea of long as the Allies occupy that capital, there is any danger of the Greek Government's entertaining such an idea.

Although the two Greek parties appear to have joined to the defence of the interests of the undersigned (Greeks), it must not be supposed that party polemics in of drawing Ministerial ascribes to the near future. The taxation proposals of the Government, which are of a really drastic nature, have naturally caused a great deal of reflection amongst the electorate and M Siratos proposes to marshal all the forces of the Opposition in an attack on the financial policy of the Government on the 11th.

Memoranda have been current of numerous defections amongst the 11th supporters, but M Giannaris informed me two days ago that he was not regarding the outcome of Monday's debate. Should he be placed in a minority, as is not impossible, there is no reason to suppose that M Siratos will be any better able to form an alternative Government now than he was two months ago. It is always possible, however, that some bargain may be struck at the last moment.

I have, &c

F. O. LINDLEY

Mr. Lindley to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received May 15.)

(No. 122.)

My Lord,

Athens, May 6, 1922

I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of a note from the Greek Minister for Foreign Affairs, respecting massacres, incendiarism and pillage alleged to have been committed by Greek troops in Asia Minor.

I have &c
P O LINDLEY

Enclosure in No. 122.

Greek Minister for Foreign Affairs to Mr. Lindley

Monsieur le Ministre, le Gouvernement turc ayant pris connaissance avec stupefaction des passages de la presse internationale aux Puisseances alliées par le Gouvernement d'Angora en date des 5 et 22 avril dernier, ayant trait aux enlèvements, massacres, incendies et pillages commis par les troupes grecques en Asie Mineure, avait devoir protester énergiquement contre ces négations outrageantes.

Il avait devoir s'élever avec indignation contre cette campagne tendancieuse ayant comme but de renverser les rôles et les responsabilités et de masquer les atrocités inouïes perpétrées par la Turquie durant toute la guerre et dans la paix.

Le Gouvernement turc, tant le Gouvernement légal, n, à maintes reprises, non seulement en état de guerre mais aussi en pleine paix, donna des ordres de sévérités en matière de massacres sur une grande échelle, contre les Grecs et les Arméniens, dont la Thrace, les provinces d'Ionie, le Pont, l'Arménie, et d'autres provinces ont été le théâtre et qui, universellement connues, ont révélé la conscience de l'humanité tout entière.

Les Puisseances alliées elles-mêmes, dans les notes adressées à la délégation ottomane durant la Conférence de la Paix, ont constaté et justament flétri les atrocités commises par la Turquie contre ses propres ressortissants.

Notamment encore des milliers de Grecs du Pont ont péri, massacrés par ordre du Gouvernement d'Angora, et les horreurs commises par ses agents en Anatolie contre les chrétiens ont égalé ses exploits antérieurs.

Le Gouvernement turc, qui avait fait une enquête sur place, prenant des mesures contre les déportations et les emprisonnements de milliers de chrétiens par les autorités ottomanes.

Aujourd'hui encore, d'après les dépositions des témoins oculaires, les populations chrétiennes qui ont été déportées ou qui ont été tuées, la population civile ayant été pour la plupart déportée, tandis que les femmes et les enfants, restés dans leurs foyers, se trouvent dans un état complet d'indigence.

Prétendre aujourd'hui qu'il faudrait procéder à la protection des Turcs contre les atrocités commises par les Grecs, c'est en vérité un jeu de mots.

Les horreurs commises contre leurs victimes, les horreurs commises ne sont pas superflues d'attirer l'attention des Puisseances alliées sur les atrocités commises par la Turquie contre les chrétiens.

Il est à noter, en dernier lieu, que la lettre du Gouvernement turc, adressée aux Puisseances alliées, a soulevé le monde musulman contre les Puisseances occidentales et les chrétiens.

Il est, tout au moins, surprenant que l'armée grecque, occupant ces territoires, n'y commette pas de nouvelles atrocités, et que ces atrocités ne cessent pas d'être commises.

Very respectfully,
BALTAZZI

Sir H. Humboldt to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received May 15.)

(No. 123.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 9, 1922

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith, for your Lordship's information, a copy of a communication emanating from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Angora Government which has been addressed to the Allied High Commissioners by the vice-president of the Ottoman Red Crescent, and which deals with an alleged renewal of atrocities by Greek troops in the zone of their occupation.

2. In discussing this communication with my colleagues together with that which formed the subject of my despatch No. 415 of the 3rd May, I expressed the opinion that the charges preferred by the Angora authorities were of too vague a nature to call for representations to the Greek High Commissioner.

3. I have therefore in both cases confined my action to the transmission of these complaints to your Lordship and to His Majesty's consul-general at Smyrna.

4. I am forwarding a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's representative at Athens.

I have &c
HORACE HUMBOLDT
High Commissioner

Enclosure in No. 123.

Note communicated by Turkish Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

Les informations parvenues récemment au Ministère des Affaires étrangères du Gouvernement turc, relatives aux atrocités commises par les troupes grecques en Asie Mineure, ont été l'objet d'une enquête sérieuse et approfondie. Les résultats de cette enquête ont été communiqués aux Puisseances alliées par les représentants turcs à la Conférence de la Paix. Les faits sont les suivants : Les troupes grecques ont commis de nombreuses atrocités contre la population civile, notamment des massacres, des incendies et des pillages. Ces faits ont été constatés par les témoins oculaires et les autorités locales.

Ces pratiques inhumaines, que ne saurait expliquer aucune nécessité de guerre, produisent, d'ailleurs, précisément l'état d'apathie de la population. Le Gouvernement hellène et ses agents militaires veulent désormais ne laisser subsister après eux qu'un monceau de ruines.

Les témoignages irrécusables et impartiaux ayant déjà fait justice des procédés de guerre en honneur chez l'armée hellène et ses chefs, qui, à présent, ont hâte de nier tout ce qui leur est défavorable, que les circonstances le permettent leur plan de destruction.

Le Gouvernement de la grande Assemblée nationale de Turquie a le devoir de protester formellement contre ces nouveaux agissements.

Encourage qu'il est par les efforts généreux déployés dans maintes circonstances par leurs Excellences MM. les Hauts-Commissaires des trois grandes Puisseances alliées en vue de limiter les souffrances des malheureuses populations turques gémissant sous un joug bien moins qu'humain, il s'empresse de faire appel une nouvelle fois à leurs sentiments humanitaires pour faire arrêter ces nouvelles violences.

Il les remercie pour tout ce qu'ils vont faire dans ce même but.

A HAMID

Constantinople le 20 avril 1922

Sir H. Humboldt to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received May 15.)

(No. 124.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 9, 1922

I HAVE the honour, with reference to your Lordship's telegram No. 197 and 198 of the 5th instant, to transmit to you herewith copy of the identical note to the

Turkish Government therein referred to, in which the Allied High Commissioners protested against the erection of tanks by the Standard Oil Company at Kurutehne and at Scutari, in the proximity of the Selimieh barracks.

The question of the danger to public safety of these depots was raised in an form as the result of the recent conflagration at the Standard Oil Company's depot at Scutari. A number of articles were published, more particularly in the *Yeni Basm*, to the risk of fire therefrom, and the in of the Grand Vizier on the subject. In the course of this High Commission had occasion to make to the prefect of the city Mr. Matthews was informed by Zia Bey that some permission had been illegally granted by a former prefect for the construction of depots, which were destined to hold small quantities of petrol, but that the Ministry had now decided that this permission should be withdrawn by the prefect, which was alone competent in such matters.

3. Moreover in the course of a visit of inspection to some coal depots in the neighbourhood of M. P. and the French representative on the Advisory Trade Committee, who was accompanied by Colonel Woods, was impressed by the unsuitability of the locality chosen for the erection of the Standard Oil Company's tanks at Selimieh. M. Picard reported in this sense to the Allied High Commissioners, and I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a copy of his memorandum to the effect.

4. It will be observed from that memorandum that the American delegate on the Advisory Trade Committee was warned on the 3rd April last of the danger created by the existence of an oil reservoir at Kurutehne.

M. Picard's memorandum was discussed at a High Commissioners' meeting on April, at which, in view of the admitted danger resulting from the use of an inflammable quarter of the town and at a crowded part of the town, it was decided to address the *Memorandum* to the Turkish Government to request the United States High Commissioner takes exception. Care was, however, taken to communicate a copy of that note to Admiral Bristol on the same day on which the *Sublime Porte* was informed.

5. It is, however, in practice responsible for the matter, it is either compatible with that responsibility to allow the matter to remain in suspense or consonant with their responsibility to permit oil companies, of their own volition and without the sanction of the United States High Commissioner, to erect depots of this nature. As is indicated, however, in the *Memorandum*, the United States High Commissioner if not actually consulted as to the tenor of the note to the Sublime Porte, was aware of the objects of the Allied High Commissioners to these tanks. Nor is this only true as regards the more recent development of this question. Your Lordship will observe, from a reference to the memorandum drawn up by Mr. Henderson and enclosed in my despatch No. 188 of the 21st February last, that as far back as November 1920 the attention of Admiral Bristol was drawn to the doubtful propriety of the erection of such installations within the zone of authority of the future Straits Commission.

6. Admiral Bristol, beyond referring that warning to his Government, would appear to have treated it otherwise as a dead letter. Even if he were inclined to contest the competence of the Allied High Commissioners to decide where American companies should or should not construct oil reservoirs at Constantinople, he could scarcely maintain that their construction is not a concern of the military authorities responsible for the security of the area under their occupation.

7. In these circumstances I cannot consider that any discourtesy has been shown to Admiral Bristol in not first submitting to him the draft of the note which the Allied High Commissioners addressed to the Turkish Government, or that there has been in this respect any departure from the rule of previous consultation with the United States High Commissioner in matters affecting

I have, &c.
HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner.

Enclosure 1 in No. 4

Memorandum Note to Turkish Government

Les Hauts Commissaires de France, de Grande-Bretagne et d'Italie ont l'honneur d'attirer l'attention de la Sublime Porte sur la construction entreprise à

l'indépendance des réserves de pétrole déjà formées par les compagnies dans leurs notes du 19 novembre 1920, du 27 avril et du 30 juin 1921. Il y a lieu d'observer que la nouvelle installation qui fait l'objet de la présente note paraît établie dans des conditions particulièrement dangereuses. Ce réservoir en effet se trouve installé à peu de distance de l'agglomération principale de Constantinople presque en bordure du Bosphore, en un point où s'alignent de nombreux bâtiments, afin, il est établi à très peu de distance du mur de clôture de la propriété où il se trouve et à très faible

qui touchent
à proximité

été donnée par une autorité qui n'a pas qualité pour le faire.

Les compagnies ne peuvent qu'insister auprès de la Sublime Porte pour que l'utilisation de ce réservoir soit interdite et pour que sa construction ne soit pas poursuivie.

La présente décision est d'ailleurs applicable à d'autres réservoirs qui, d'après des renseignements reçus également par les compagnies, sont en construction à Selimie

Constantinople, le 13 avril 1922

Enclosure 2 in No. 124

M. Picard to Allied High Commissioners.

J'ai l'honneur de porter à votre connaissance que me étant rendu à Kurutehne avec M. le Colonel Wood, mon collègue au Comité de l'Énergie, pour examiner sur place les dépôts de charbon installés dans cette localité, nous avons constaté que la compagnie Standard Oil construisait, dans l'enceinte où elle a déjà établi des dépôts pour pétrole en bidons, un réservoir pour pétrole en vrac, d'une contenance approximative de 1,000 à 1,500 mètres cubes.

Nous estimons, mon collègue et moi, que l'existence d'un pareil réservoir, dans la banlieue de Constantinople, à proximité du Bosphore constitue un danger sérieux, et nous avons avisé notre collègue américain au Comité consultatif du Commerce lors de notre première réunion du 3 courant, tenue le matin, que nous rendrions compte de nos constatations à nos Hauts-Commissaires respectifs.

Mr Shaw a constaté d'ailleurs les inconvénients pouvant résulter de la mise en service du réservoir.

Par contre, un ingénieur de la Standard Oil convoqué à la demande des compagnies, a déclaré que les réservoirs de cette nature devraient être établis au moins à 50 mètres des clôtures de la parcelle dans laquelle ils sont construits. Or, dans le cas qui nous occupe, cette distance n'atteint que quelques mètres du côté sud-est, bien au-dessous de 50 mètres du côté

E 4994 53 44]

No. 125

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston—(Received May 15.)

No. 432.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 9, 1922.

In my despatch No. 418 of the 3rd May, I referred to the impression created by a visit of the Patriarch Meletios to the parish of Tatavla on the Pera side of the Golden Horn. It now appears that he is carrying out a series of such visitations.

2. On the 24th April, Mgr. Meletios paid a State visit to the important suburb of Kadiköy on the Asiatic side. According to a report furnished by the Allied police

officer there, he spoke for forty-five minutes at the local Cathedral, and dealt entirely with the Turks; referred to a protest against the restoration of Smyrna to Moslem rule, which is said to have been addressed to the Pope by Catholics in Smyrna; contrasted the recovery of Alsace-Lorraine by the French with the proposal that the Greeks should give up what was won by promise and by conquest, and said that even if the Athens Government ordered withdrawal, the Greek troops would not obey.

3. On the 7th May, the Patriarch paid a similar visit to the Church of Saint Nicolas in Guata to attend a mass for the repose of the souls of the victims of persecution in the Pontus region. Here again he appears to have delivered a political speech, though I have received no detailed report of it as yet.

4. These proceedings of Mgr. Meletius are exceedingly dangerous at a time like the present. Their undesirability is enhanced by the fact that it is now Ramadan, and attempts are being made on the Turkish side to inflame Moslem fanaticism here in the capital. Both sides are assuming an attitude which might easily menace public order. Indeed, General Harrington has written to me officially regarding the ill-consideredness of the Patriarch's performance at Kadik.

5. I am causing an intimation to be conveyed to Mgr. Meletius that, if he enjoys liberty of action here, it is due to the presence of an Allied force of occupation, and that he owes it to the Allied authorities not to abuse that liberty. It would, I fear, be useless to address any direct threat to him for he is a determined man, but I am letting it be understood that if he and others cannot see their way to use common prudence in their public acts and utterances, the Allied authorities may be compelled to take measures to ensure that public order is not threatened.

I have, &c.

HORACE R. MIBOLD

High Commissioner

E 5039 6 44

No. 126

Lord Hardinge to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 16.)

(No. 1177.)

His Majesty's Ambassador at Paris presents his compliments to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and has the honour to transmit herewith M. Poincaré's letter of the 14th May respecting the attitude of the Allied Governments towards the reply of the Angora Government.

Paris, May 15, 1922

Enclosure in No. 126

M. Poincaré to Lord Hardinge

Ministère des Affaires étrangères.

Paris, le 15 mai 1922

M. le Chef d'Affaires.

Vous savez bien voulu, le 12 de ce mois, me communiquer une lettre du principal Secrétaire d'Etat de Sa Majesté exposant les appréhensions que cause au Gouvernement britannique le retard subi par l'action entreprise par les Gouvernements alliés, en vue de hâter le rétablissement de la paix en Orient. Après avoir rappelé les différentes communications échangées par les Gouvernements de Grèce et de Turquie depuis la réunion des trois Ministres des Affaires étrangères, après avoir constaté que les délais survenus étaient dus en partie au souci du Gouvernement de Constantinople de faire concorder son attitude avec celle du Gouvernement d'Angora, son Excellence le Marquess Curzon examine principalement la dernière réponse du Gouvernement d'Angora en date du 22 avril. Cette réponse ne pouvait assurément pas être considérée comme satisfaisante dans son ensemble. Cependant, comme conclusion, le Gouvernement d'Angora déclarait être prêt à envoyer ses délégués à une réunion des plénipotentiaires alliés qui se tiendrait à la fin.

Son Excellence Lord Hardinge m'a fait savoir, le 21 avril, que le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté estimait inutile de prolonger une discussion avec le Gouvernement d'Angora. Je tiens à faire connaître à Lord Hardinge les motifs qui, à mon avis, ont amené ce

E 4959 900 44]

No. 125a

Sir M. Cheetham to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 15.)

(No. 1163.)

My Lord,

Paris, May 13, 1922.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 1111 of the 6th May regarding the French claim to a protectorate over the Catholics in the Near East, I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith a copy of the note addressed on the 11th May to the French Government by the Italian Ambassador with which his Excellency has been so good as to furnish me.

I have, &c.

MILNE CHEETHAM

Enclosure in No. 1.

Italian Ambassador to French Government.

M. le Président,

Paris, le 11 mai 1922

A L'OCCASION de la mort du Pape Benoît XV, ainsi que de l'élection du nouveau Souverain Pontife, le délégué apostolique à Constantinople, ayant décidé de célébrer des cérémonies religieuses solennelles, pria les représentants des Puissances d'y assister.

Les Hauts-Commissaires italien et britannique, ayant été informés que le Haut-Commissaire français aurait eu, à titre de protecteur des intérêts catholiques, une place privilégiée, désolèrent, à leur regret, de ne pas assister aux dites cérémonies.

Le Gouvernement italien a approuvé la ligne de conduite de M. le Marquess Curzon. Mon Gouvernement estime, et m'a chargé d'en informer votre Excellence, que la France a déclaré aux délégués à la Conférence de San-Remo, le 24 avril, dans les prochains verbaux de ladite conférence, renoncer à la protection des catholiques en Orient—protection que, d'ailleurs, le Gouvernement italien n'avait

Mon Gouvernement estime, en effet, que les déclarations faites par M. Millerand à San-Remo, tout en ayant été prononcées à l'occasion de la discussion sur la Palestine, ne s'appliquent pas moins à tout l'Orient, vu le caractère général de la discussion, et notamment la déclaration de M. Nitti (p. 23 du Procès-verbal No. 12 de la Conférence de San-Remo), avec laquelle M. Millerand se déclarait d'accord.

La Conférence de la Paix et les conférences qui ont suivi ont constamment appliqué la règle suivant laquelle les notes et les procès-verbaux, après communication aux différentes délégations, font pleine foi, et que les déclarations y inscrites, ainsi que toutes déclarations, constituent un engagement solennel entre les Puissances alliées.

On ne saurait donc contester la pleine validité de la déclaration de M. Millerand, qui donna à ses mots une signification bien précise et générale.

J'ai, pourtant, l'honneur de prier votre Excellence si, comme j'estime, une étude de la question et des textes lui fera reconnaître le bien-fondé du point de vue du Cabinet de Rome, de vouloir bien donner communication au Saint-Siège de la renonciation du Gouvernement français, afin que les missions catholiques en Orient soient informées qu'elles ne sont pas tenues à rendre les "honneurs" aux représentants de la France, vu que ces "honneurs" sont l'expression extérieure de la protection dont on ne comprendrait pas la fin sans la coexistence contemporaine des "honneurs". Il serait utile, pour éviter des froissements, qu'une communication analogue fût faite aux autorités françaises.

Je remercie à l'avance votre Excellence de la réponse qu'elle voudra bien me faire en dispositions qui auront été prises à ce sujet.

Je vous prie, &c.

[Unghed]

demeure immédiate adressée aux Turcs et j'insiste sur l'intérêt, pour les Alliés et pour la cause de la paix, de ne pas se refuser à la réunion proposée.

De la lettre de Lord Curzon que vous venez de me communiquer, il paraît résulter que le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté a, sur certains points importants, donné à la réponse du Gouvernement d'Angora une signification sensiblement différente de celle le a aux yeux du Gouvernement français.

La lettre de Lord Curzon à ma lettre du 1^{er} mai permettait, en se prolongeant, d'interrompre la progression de nos efforts communs pour rétablir la paix en Orient.

Il a paru au principal Secrétaire d'Etat de Sa Majesté que la réunion que Youssouf Kémal avait en vue était une réunion à l'amiable, avec les plénipotentiaires alliés, sans l'aval des représentants des

les représentants des Gouvernements de Constantinople et pas à la réunion précitée. Bien.

regler son attitude sur celle d'Angora, n'aurait pas à la fin de sa réponse du 2

de envoyer le plus tôt possible ses délégués à la conférence et leur présence étant exigée par le Gouvernement d'Angora. En ce qui concerne l'envoi des délégués helléniques, il appartient au Gouvernement d'Athènes de faire connaître ses intentions et il y aurait, sans doute, lieu de les lui demander. Les réunions projetées doivent comprendre des délégués des trois Gouvernements d'Angora, de Constantinople et d'Angora conformément à la procédure convenue par les Ministres anglais, français et turcs récemment réunis à Paris.

Il n'est, en effet, aucunement dans la pensée du Gouvernement français de s'écarter de cette procédure et il considère que la conclusion des préliminaires de paix doit résulter que d'une réunion à laquelle participent les trois Gouvernements intéressés et qui aura pour base de ses travaux les propositions que les Alliés ont formulées à la suite des réunions de Paris. Avec le Gouvernement britannique, il a constaté que la réponse d'Angora, comme d'ailleurs celle de Constantinople, n'était pas satisfaisante; il doit constater également que le Gouvernement britannique n'a encore, ni ce n'est sur la proposition d'armistice donné aucune

les Alliés ne pouvaient

ne paraissent pas pouvoir acceptation acquise, la conférence pourrait, conformément entre les Alliés, continuer ses travaux pour aboutir à la conclusion des préliminaires de paix.

Ainsi, le Gouvernement français ne propose aucunement d'introduire dans la procédure convenue un nouveau stade de négociations. Il estime même qu'il n'y aurait pas lieu de se prêter à l'envoi à Constantinople par Moustapha Kémal d'un représentant chargé de demander aux Hautes-Commissaires des informations complémentaires sur les propositions de paix des Alliés. Une semblable mission pourrait, en effet, paraître comme une action séparée avec une seule des parties intéressées et contraire à la procédure adoptée.

Comme le principal Secrétaire d'Etat, je considère qu'il y a danger à laisser le temps s'écouler sans que se manifeste une progression des efforts des Alliés, progression qui contribue à réellement pour une large part à éviter une reprise des hostilités.

ce qui concerne le lieu où se tiendrait la conférence, il est à considérer que la ville d'Ismid, étant sur les territoires occupés par le Gouvernement d'Angora, présente des inconvénients analogues à ceux qu'aurait le voisinage immédiat de Constantinople et qu'il serait préférable de ne réunir les délégués sur le territoire d'aucun des belligérants. D'autre part, il y aurait intérêt à choisir un point d'où les communications

Angora, qui est d'accès particulièrement difficile. Il est plus important encore que Moustapha Kémal, avec qui un contact direct serait utile, ne soit pas empêché de venir à la conférence par la crainte de s'éloigner d'Anatolie et reste en mesure, tout en étant présent à cette réunion, de contenir les éléments extrémistes d'Angora, de maintenir

son autorité sur ses troupes et d'assurer aussi l'observation des décisions que la conférence serait amenée à prendre et notamment l'exécution de l'armistice et de l'escarmouche. Pour ces raisons le Gouvernement français propose que la réunion ait lieu à bord d'un bâtiment de guerre ainsi se tenant dans la rade d'Istanbul. Bâtiment qu'il est prêt à mettre à la disposition des Gouvernements alliés.

Le Gouvernement français qui, comme le Gouvernement britannique, est pénétré de l'idée que l'unité d'action des Gouvernements alliés est plus que jamais nécessaire, a l'honneur de proposer au Gouvernement britannique l'envoi aux Gouvernements de Constantinople et d'Angora, comme à celui d'Athènes, d'une note identique où ces Gouvernements seraient invités à nommer sans retard leurs délégués, qui devront se rendre à l'endroit désigné pour la conférence. Cette procédure est la seule qui, tenant compte des difficultés présentes, peut permettre d'espérer un règlement ou aboutir à un accord. Elle constitue une dernière tentative de conciliation pour les Gouvernements alliés, de ne pas assumer la responsabilité d'une rupture les obligeant immédiatement à effectuer

de sans persévérer qu'une mise en demeure adressée aux Etats belligérants

par eux et marquerait une reprise immédiate des hostilités.

Le Gouvernement de la République ne voudrait pas envisager la responsabilité de

de la Marine, et d'attachement du 112 à son tour le plus tôt possible, et, comme je l'espère, il veut bien le partager

POINCARÉ

E 5244 48 44

No 127

Sir A. Geddes to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston — (Received May 2)

No. 417. Confidential.
My Lord,

Washington, May 11, 1922

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's despatch No. 387 of the 29th March last concerning the attitude of the American High Commissioner at Constantinople and his complaints of Allied discrimination against American interests. At my request, Mr. Craigie first discussed this matter informally, but fully, with Mr. Dullax, the new head of the Near Eastern Division of the State Department, who has just returned to Washington after a year of service as first secretary of the American High Commission at Constantinople. When the way had been thus prepared, I took the opportunity to mention the matter to the Secretary of

American High Commissioner and his colleagues were adding to the heavy burden of responsibility which already rested upon the shoulders of the Allied High Commissioners. The Secretary of State at once sent for Mr. Dullax, and the conversation was mainly between that officer and myself, the Secretary of State being a passive listener.

As a result of these discussions, I have gained the impression that the Secretary of State has personally a limited knowledge of the situation in Constantinople, and has left the supervision of American affairs there to subordinates, and that, possibly because of difficulties arising from Admiral Bristol's naval status, they have left him to conduct affairs in his own way and largely at his own discretion, and, at the same time, that Admiral Bristol, while not primarily desiring to create trouble for his colleagues, has

would suffer were he not to exercise the utmost vigilance, and in accord with what he considers the tendency of the Allied High Commissioners to use the existing situation for the furtherance of their national interests. Apparently, too, whenever Admiral Bristol does not quite understand what is being done, he assumes that American interests are being sacrificed, and is prepared to accept as corroborative evidence any statement by any person, provided it impugns the motives of one or other of the High Commissioners. It seems clear that, in the mind of the American High Commissioner, suspicion of the French and Italian Commissioners is more fully developed than is their suspicion of our motives, though they evidently have a greater fear of our capacity. In the more reasonable American view the main difficulty throughout has been one of procedure. The absence of sufficient personal contact between the American

High Commissioner and his colleagues has, in this opinion, led to the writing of a great number of notes in regard to questions which might more easily have been settled by verbal discussion.

One solution of this particular difficulty, which I gather would be agreeable to the State Department, would be that Admiral Bristol should be invited to attend meetings of the High Commissioners at which questions relating to American interests are likely to arise. Mr. Dullax, however, who appeared to concur in the opinion of Mr. Dullax that, if the Allied High Commissioners thought fit to issue such invitations, a great deal of misunderstanding and a large amount of note writing might thereby be avoided. It is, of course, impossible for me to judge at this distance whether such a suggestion is likely to find favour with Sir Horace Rumbold and his colleagues. I recognise, indeed, that there may be very valid reasons for not acting upon it. On general grounds, however, and as part of our existing policy towards this country, it would seem sound policy to interest American representatives, as observers or in any other capacity, in councils and conferences convened for the purpose of discussing matters in which American interests are either directly or indirectly concerned.

As regards the last paragraph of Sir Horace Rumbold's despatch, it may perhaps be worth mentioning that, according to Mr. Dullax, the policy of the High Commission is to inform Americans who desire to proceed to the interior for the purpose of extracting concessions from the Khalist Government that, if they get into difficulties, they cannot expect assistance from the American Government which has no representative at Angora. In other words, the American High Commission is taking no active steps to encourage Americans to seek concessions in the existing state of things, though they do not actually discourage them from concerning upon such enterprises. Moreover Mr. Dullax pointed out that while no doubt Great Britain is abiding by the self-denying ordinance which precludes Allied subjects from acquiring concessions during the armistice period, this has by no means been the case so far as French and Italian interests are concerned. He added that, so far as he himself was concerned, he had no knowledge that such an ordinance or an understanding existed.

At the close of our discussion the Secretary of State assured me that he would write privately to Admiral Bristol and inform him that he was in no manner that the best possible relations should be maintained with the High Allied Governments, and that nothing should be done unnecessarily to increase the burden already resting upon their shoulders.

Finally, I think it may safely be said that Admiral Bristol's mind has been agitated by these agents have been directed to create anti-British sentiment among supposed interests of the company, and how far anti-British persons have been able to use the Standard Oil organization for their own ends, I have never been able accurately to decide. At present Mr. Bedford's propaganda machine is being held back from anti-British activity for reasons which it is unnecessary here to discuss. This appears to me to provide an opportunity for placing the relations with Admiral Bristol on a more pleasant footing.

I have, &c

A. C. GEDDES

E 5201 5 44]

No 128

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston — (Received May 22)

(No. 437)

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 11,

IN continuation of my despatch No. 425, I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of the notes exchanged between Izzet Pasha and Maryia Givrenis with reference to the recent agreement concluded between the Italian Government and the Constantinople Government, as well as a copy of the agreement.

I have, &c

HORACE RUMBOLD,

High Commissioner.

Enclosure 1 in No. 128.

Izzet Pasha to Italian High Commissioner

M. le Haut-Commissaire,
 Sublime Porte, le 15 avril 1922
 J'ai l'honneur de vous adresser, ci-joint, à votre Excellence le projet d'accord relatif à la concession par des groupes italiens de certaines entreprises d'utilité publique en Asie Mineure (ports, voies ferrées, mines, etc.)
 Vous en ferez l'honneur de le déclarer véritablement à votre Excellence, au moment de la signature par le Cabinet actuel.
 Cependant, si le présent Cabinet devait se retirer avant la susdite signature, celui qui lui succéderait aura le droit, s'il le jugera opportun, de dénoncer le présent accord.
 En priant votre Excellence de bien vouloir me confirmer qu'elle est d'accord sur le contenu de la présente, je suis, etc.

A. IZZET

Enclosure 2 in No. 128.

Italian High Commissioner to Izzet Pasha.

Altezza,
 Constantinople, le 15 avril 1922.
 J'ai l'honneur de recevoir la note que votre Altesse a bien voulu m'adresser, le 15 avril 1922, pour me transmettre l'accord relatif à l'établissement et à l'exploitation par des groupes italiens de certaines entreprises d'utilité publique en Asie Mineure (ports, voies ferrées, mines, etc.).
 En réponse, je m'empresse de confirmer à votre Altesse que je suis d'accord avec elle sur le contenu de la susdite note.
 Il est donc bien entendu que l'accord en question entrera en vigueur au moment de la signature par le Cabinet actuel du Traité de Paix à intervenir entre les grandes Puissances de l'Entente et la Turquie; et que, si, cependant, le présent Cabinet devait se retirer avant la susdite signature, celui qui lui succéderait aura le droit, s'il le juge opportun, de dénoncer le présent accord.

Je suis, etc.
GARRONI

Enclosure 3 in No. 128.

Agreement.

LES hautes parties soussignées, son Excellence M. le Marquis Garroni, Haut-Commissaire italien à Constantinople, et son Excellence Izzet Pacha, Ministre des Affaires étrangères de Sa Majesté impériale le Sultan, d'une part, pour le Gouvernement ottoman,

Considérant

Qu'une étroite collaboration économique entre les deux pays méditerranéens ne saurait être que d'un commun avantage,

Qu'elles désirent en général faciliter et assurer par tous les moyens le développement

Que le Gouvernement ottoman désire mettre en valeur et développer les ressources du pays, assurer l'exploitation rationnelle de ses richesses naturelles, faciliter les moyens de transport par la construction de chemins de fer, ports, quais, etc.

Que le Gouvernement italien, de son côté, désire faciliter l'exécution du programme économique du Gouvernement ottoman, afin d'intensifier les relations commerciales et industrielles entre l'Italie et la Turquie.

Ont arrêté et convenu de qui suit

1. Le Gouvernement impérial ottoman s'engage à prendre en considération les demandes de concession qui lui seront présentées par des groupes industriels ou financiers, recommandées par le Gouvernement italien, pour les constructions et exploitations des entreprises d'utilité publique ci-après :

(a) L'exploitation conformément aux lois et règlements en vigueur ou à promulguer de toutes les couches ou mines de charbon se trouvant dans le périmètre du

basin houiller dit d'Héraclée, dont le plan est annexé à la présente,* et pour lesquelles des concessions ou droits d'exploitation n'ont pas encore été obtenus, ou permises par suite des dispositions légales en vigueur ou qui ont fait retour à l'Etat également en conformité des mêmes dispositions.

(b) L'autorisation de créer une centrale électrique dans le bassin d'Héraclée et de transporter l'énergie électrique jusqu'à Constantinople avec droit de distribution sur le parcours sans préjudice des droits de concession existants.

(c) L'autorisation pour l'étude, dans le but de la construction et de l'exploitation des voies ferrées suivantes :

- (1) De Kutahya à Brouse (et éventuellement le rachat de ligne Brouse-Moudania).
- (2) De Konia au lac de Bay Chehir à Adana.
- (3) D'Adana à Bourbour et à Abon Kara-Hisar.
- (4) Eregh-Bolou.
- (5) D'Ermouk à Sefliké.
- (6) Eregh-Cemre Sivas.

(d) L'autorisation pour procéder à l'étude, dans le but de la construction et de l'exploitation des ports, jolées et entrepôts à Adana, Moudania et à Sefliké.

(e) L'autorisation pour l'étude des travaux nécessaires à la navigation et à l'irrigation de la vallée du Meandre.

(f) L'autorisation pour l'exploitation des mines de plomb argentifères de Boulgar-Dag.

2. Les groupes précités devront, dans l'intervalle de cinq années à partir de la date de la ratification par la Turquie du Traité de Paix à intervenir entre elle et les Etats de l'Entente, avoir terminé et présenté au Département compétent les études préliminaires que les entreprises ci-haut susdites comportent, ainsi que les propositions des conditions dans lesquelles ils en assument la construction et l'exploitation.

Les entreprises dont les études n'auraient pas été présentées dans le délai précité ne bénéficieront pas du présent accord.

3. Le Gouvernement ottoman se réserve le droit d'examiner et de modifier les propositions des groupes précités. Si le Gouvernement ottoman et les groupes tant sur la totalité des propositions que sur quelques-unes d'entre elles, les groupes devront mettre à la disposition du Gouvernement les études concernant les propositions non agréées. Dans ce cas, les frais relatifs à ces études établis en commun accord leur seront remboursés par le Gouvernement. Si un groupe ne présente pas pour ses frais, ceux-ci seront fixés par voie d'arbitrage.

4. L'article qui précède, si le Gouvernement se décide à refuser, l'une quelconque de ces concessions aux étrangers, il devra, à conditions égales, donner aux groupes italiens un droit de préférence en leur communiquant les conditions auxquelles il est disposé à accorder ces concessions et en leur donnant un délai de trois mois pour se présenter.

5. Si le délai précité de cinq années écoulé, le Gouvernement ottoman est de tout engagement et libre d'accorder les concessions à tels groupes qu'il lui plaira. Il est bien entendu que si le Gouvernement ottoman décide la construction et l'exploitation des concessions dont il s'agit par ses propres moyens ou bien par les capitaux ottomans, sans recourir à des capitalistes étrangers, le droit de préférence prévu à l'article précédent ne saura jouer.

6. Dans les sociétés ottomanes à constituer par les groupes italiens qui auront obtenu une concession, il sera réservé aux groupes ottomans, recommandés par le Gouvernement ottoman, une part de 50 pour cent du capital à souscrire. Le montant du capital sera fixé, pour chacune des concessions, entre le Gouvernement et le groupe.

N.B.—Dans le cas où la réalisation des entreprises mentionnées dans le présent accord empêcherait sur des droits précédemment reconnus, le Gouvernement ottoman décline toute responsabilité quant à l'exécution des engagements ci-haut mentionnés et sera dispensé du paiement de tout dommage ou indemnité de ce chef.

A. IZZET
GARRONI

Sublime Porte, le 15 avril 1922

E 5204 27 44]

No. 129

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 22)

No. 442)

HIS Majesty's representative at Constantinople presents his compliments to His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and has the honour to herewith copy of despatch No. 78 from His Majesty's consul-general at Smyrna respecting the Mikraasiatic movement in Asia Minor.

Constantinople, May 13, 1922

Enclosure in No. 1

Consul-General Lamb to Sir H. Rumbold

Smyrna, May 1, 1922

WITH reference to Mr. Vice Consul Hole's memorandum on the objects and resources of the Mikraasiatic National Defence Committee, which I have had the pleasure of transmitting to your Excellency separately, I would venture to offer the following

... the withdrawal, unaccompanied by any intimation that it was not intended to be obeyed, would be accepted by the superior officers and carried out by the bulk of their command. I believe that such an order could be provoked if the Greek Government and King were thoroughly convinced that the Allies sincerely in their desire to see it carried out. ... the significance of which cannot fail to be considerably encouraged the Greeks.

5. As things are to-day, therefore, I am more than ever convinced that a peaceful evacuation of Anatolia cannot be hoped for in the absence of a strong covering force of

... the situation ...

7. ... There is much to be said in favour of such a line, if it were intended to form a really autonomous State in which the two elements, Christian and Muslim, were to ... fighting with its back to the sea, it seems to me already somewhat too far extended. A line from the Gulf of Adramydt through Soma to Alashehir would probably be the longest that they could hope to defend.

8. The estimates of Mr. Hole's informant (to whose name it would naturally be desirable to give the least possible publicity) as regards both the numbers of men that could be raised and the amount of financial assistance that could be relied upon, appears

to me to err somewhat in the direction of optimism. I have, however, little doubt the considerable contributions will be forthcoming from Greek colonies abroad, and both questions have been most carefully studied by expert sub-committees.

9. A copy of this despatch and of the memorandum under reference is being forwarded to His Britannic Majesty's Legation at Athens.

I have, &c

HARRY H. LAMB

E 5206 3673 44]

No. 130

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 22)

(No. 444)

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 15, 1922

THE Japanese High Commissioner called on me on the 15th instant and informed me that he had information to the effect that the Soviet Government had informed the Angora Government that the latter must not come to terms with the Allied Powers. The Soviet Government further stated that were to come to terms with the Allied Powers, the Soviet Government, for its part, would cancel the Treaty of Kars. I asked the Japanese High Commissioner whether he considered his information reliable, but he was not explicit on this point.

2. There have been reports that the National Assembly at Angora has lately held some secret sessions, at which the future orientation of Nationalist policy was discussed. The question was as to whether the Nationalists were to go in for an Asiatic policy or still attempt to come to terms with the Western Powers. Having regard to the foregoing, the information given me by the Japanese High Commissioner is not without interest.

3. The Japanese High Commissioner then said that he understood that at the proposed conference between the Greeks and Turks, with the participation of the three Allied Powers, the Soviet Government would be invited to send a representative. He stated that the Soviet Government should assist at the proposed conference.

I have, &c

HORACE RUMBOLD

High Commissioner

E 5207 5 44]

No. 131

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 22)

No. 446

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 16, 1922

WITH reference to my despatch No. 408 of the 1st May, I have the honour to state that, while the internal political situation at Angora is still exceedingly obscure, there are certain further indications that the Grand National Assembly is no longer an actual body or a docile instrument in the hands of Mustafa Kemal Pasha.

2. Mustafa Kemal was recently confirmed by the Assembly in his office of commander-in-chief of the army for a further period of three months from the 5th May. There would appear to have been some opposition, however, as the necessary law was passed by a majority vote, not unanimously.

3. A more significant symptom of misadventure is the great delay which has occurred in the formation of the Council of Ministers. The Commission of Finance was in paragraph 3 of my despatch under reference. The Commission of Finance was previously Vice-President of the Assembly. The other two vacancies which occurred about the same time were filled only about the 11th May. The more important of the two was the Commission of Economic Affairs. The former incumbent, Sirri Bey, was vigorously interpellated on or about the 25th April, and a vote of confidence was asked for. Sirri Bey obtained a majority, but as there was no quorum the vote was

invalid. A second vote some days later resulted in a tie. A third gave a very small majority against Sirri Bey.

4. Mustapha Kemal then submitted three candidates for the post in accordance with the usual practice, but on a vote being taken it proved impossible to elect a commissioner owing to the very large number of abstentions. The matter stood over, and it was only after ten days or so that the post was filled by the election of Husein Bey, who three weeks ago vacated the Commissionership of Finance.

A similar delay occurred in the election of Abdulah Azim Efendi to the vacant Commissionership of Religious Affairs, but I have no special information regarding this.

6. The probable meaning of these incidents is that Mustapha Kemal is still able to impose his will on the Assembly, but has increasing difficulty in doing so. There is nothing in them to alter my previously expressed conviction that, whatever dimensions my visit at Angora, the bulk of the Assembly remain faithful to the National Pact, that the partisans of a "Russian orientation" of foreign policy are still in the ascendant, and that the Bolsheviks.

The situation at the Conference, which should be... on should be... the... of Union and Progress in its old form with a view to giving that body control of the situation in Turkey as a whole, both Anatolia and Constantinople. I am unable on my present information to judge between these two theories, but I am following as closely as possible the new development.

8. While these speculative possibilities are worth bearing in mind, I feel that great caution should be used in accepting the view, to which some observers of the situation incline, that there is already a radical alteration in the relations between Angora and Moscow. Even if France broke home from Great Britain and carried Italy with her, so far as the Eastern question is concerned, a complete understanding between these two countries and the Kemal Government would not be so very easy of realisation, despite all the efforts of Ferid Bey in Paris, Hamid Bey here, and Jafaruddin Arif Bey in Italy, to facilitate it. In the meanwhile Mustapha Kemal is not likely to throw the substance of an alliance with Moscow for the uncertain prospect of an understanding with two only of the three Western Powers.

I have, &c.
HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner.

E 5211 557 44

No. 132

H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received May 22.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 17, 1922

A CONSIDERABLE flutter was caused in Constantinople on the 11th May by the announcement that Javid Bey, former Minister of Finance, had on the previous day been elected Turkish delegate on the Public Debt Council to replace Husein Javid Bey.

Javid Bey is reported to have been elected, but it was not generally known that he was a candidate for this particular post.

2. The election was held in the usual way at the prefecture of the city. Fourteen of Javid Bey. One newspaper, which is evidently not friendly to him, lays stress on the fact that only four of them were Moslems, the others being Greeks, Armenians and Jews.

3. There appears to be no doubt that the election was engineered by French financial interests, including those concerned in the Ottoman Bank and the Tobacco Company.

4. It is too soon to say what, if any, political significance attaches to this incident.

As your Lordship is aware, Javid Bey was a leading light in the Committee of Union and Progress, and was a member of the Turkish Government immediately before and during the war. Soon after the armistice he was marked down for arrest by or at the instance of the Allied authorities, but he made good his escape from Constantinople. He has spent most of the time since his escape in Switzerland, where he has been intimately connected with Turkish propaganda. While in Switzerland he successfully revived his old relations with French financiers, and has more than once been in France. He was in Paris at the time of the recent Near East Conference.

5. The local press states that Javid Bey has been informed of his election, and is expected to arrive very shortly in Constantinople. Sir Adam Black, however, considers it unlikely that he will return in the immediate future. His information confirms the view that Javid Bey owes his election to French financial support, and tends to show that an arrangement exists between Javid and Husein Javid Bey whereby the latter will share the salary.

6. Although Javid Bey has worked hard in the Turkish interest in Europe, there is no reason to suppose that he is particularly well regarded in Angora. If his election to the Public Debt Council has any present political importance, it is probably in connection with the renewal of activity on the part of the old guard of the Union and Progress Party. According to one theory this renewal of activity is the result of an agreement between the Union and Progress leaders still abroad and the Angora Committee of Union and Progress in its old form with a view to giving that body control of the situation in Turkey as a whole, both Anatolia and Constantinople. I am unable on my present information to judge between these two theories, but I am following as closely as possible the new development.

I have, &c.
HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner.

E 5383 19 441

No. 133

Comte de Saint-Aulaire to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received May 25.)

Le rapport de Younouk Kemal au Général Pellé, le village de Ferendje, dans le district de Torbalı, aurait été mis à sac par les Grecs, ainsi que la localité de Çamlıca, près de Smyrne. Le Comité révolutionnaire arménien Dacheak aurait décidé de déloger à Smyrne le Général Toroman, célèbre par les massacres qu'il perpétra sur les populations musulmanes après la retraite des armées russes en 1917. En attendant que les Comités arméniens entrent en action sur une vaste échelle, des bandes grecques, avec le concours des troupes régulières grecques, toutes les maisons auraient été mises à sac. Des faits analogues ne seraient produits dans la localité d'Avram, près d'Alacholur, de Bey-Uni, de Seuké, &c.

Ces allégations n'ont pu être vérifiées par les autorités françaises. Toutefois, le Ministre des Affaires étrangères à Paris estime qu'au moment où les Turcs et les Grecs s'opposent mutuellement des faits de ce genre, il y aurait lieu pour le moins s'ils sont reconnus exacts, d'en faire état dans la protestation que, suivant la suggestion du Gouvernement français les Ministres alliés devraient adresser au Gouvernement allemand.

Le Comte de Saint-Aulaire salut, &c.

Ambassade de France, Londres,
le 24 mai 1922

Mr. Lindley to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 29.)

(No. 245.)

My Lord,

Athens, May 20, 1922

I HAVE the honour to report that the statement made by Mr. Chamberlain in the House of Commons on the 18th instant was reproduced in every newspaper in Athens, accompanied by the most favourable comments. It is evidently believed by the public there is no Government at the present time, that the impression made in England by the latest Turkish atrocities may be the precursor of a more active policy on the part of Great Britain, without which no one here believes in the possibility of settling the Eastern question in a satisfactory manner.

In these circumstances it may be useful to take stock over more of the general situation. No doubt your Lordship is kept fully informed of the military prospects in Asia Minor. To me, who have no recent information on the subject, it was of particular interest to hear to-day the views of Colonel Giordano, the Italian Staff Officer, who has been for a long time in Smyrna. He declared that the Kemalists were incapable of any serious military enterprise, but that the Greeks were not in a position to round them up. It was, in fact, a case of stale-mate, and would continue to be so until the financial exhaustion of the Greeks caused a change to their disadvantage. This is the view that has prevailed for some time in well-informed circles and seems good enough to accept and work on.

It seems equally well-established that the Kemalists, in spite of their military weakness, will be contented with nothing less than the National Pact, which they expect

The recent forced loan has put the Greek Government in funds for a certain number of months, but the late Minister of Finance said to me a few days ago, almost with tears in his eyes, that this unexpected windfall was just sufficient to effect the demobilisation of the Greek army, for which purpose it ought certainly to be used. Once it was exhausted, there was no possibility of Greece raising another penny, and the issue of uncovered paper would achieve the ruin of the country.

counted upon as a serious factor, is to be utilised to make a determined effort to effect a settlement, or whether matters are to be allowed to drift until both Greece and Asia

are prepared to put serious pressure upon the Kemalists, the latter eventually is will not be long now before the situation gets completely out of hand, and we shall

despairing efforts to preserve peace during the last few days before the great war.

The Paris peace proposals appear to have definitely broken down before obstinacy of the Kemalists on the one hand and the failure of the minority clauses to satisfy those principally concerned, that they will be adequately protected. Some new proposals must be found to take their place, and it would appear that the recently

Minor, offers a suitable opportunity to put them forward.

I venture, therefore, to suggest that a final effort be made to obtain the co-operation of France and Italy in intimating to the Kemalists that, unless they are ready to accept the revised terms, which should include autonomy for the Smyrna zone, the Turkish support as we find it

F. O. LINDLEY.

Sir H. Humboldt to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 29.)

(No. 462.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 29, 1922

FOLLOWING upon the recent conference in Paris between your Lordship and the Allied Ministers for Foreign Affairs, the Allied High Commission has asked their representatives on the Juridical Commission to study certain articles of the Treaty of Sevres in the light of their local experience, with a view to formulating recommendations for submission to the Allied Governments of such modifications as they consider should be incorporated in the new treaty which will eventually be framed.

2. I have now the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith, copies of the minutes embodying the views of the Juridical Commission, and to express my concurrence in its recommendations.

I have, &c.

HORACE HUMBOLDT,

High Commissioner

Enclosure 1 in No. 134.

Note by Mr. Waugh

THE minutes of the Juridical Commission of the 3rd, 6th, 8th, 10th and 13th May, 1922, contain recommendations resulting from Juridical Commission's examination of the Treaty of Sevres in the light of the recent conference in Paris, as recorded in the resolutions annexed to the minutes of that conference.

The following are the most important points noted:—

Article 128. Recognition of foreign nationality acquired by Ottoman subjects is unreasonable. Every Ottoman Greek would become a Hellenic subject in Turkey.

Article 136. "Capitulatory Powers" to be consulted on judicial reform should be read as Powers which enjoyed Capitulation rights before the war. See article 2.

Article 144. Rights of foreign creditors of Armenians plundered at 1915 should be protected.

Article 261. Extension of Capitulations to new States should be qualified so that they should raise no pretension to a voice in the discussion of judicial reform in Turkey.

Following paragraph should be added:—

"En conséquence, aucune loi ou règlement promulgué en violation des droits capitulaires ne pourra être appliqué aux ressortissants alliés à moins d'être expressément accepté par les Puissances alliées."

Article 300. The indemnity must be expressly extended to cover the period of the armistice.

Article 302. Allied traders resident in Turkey should be given the benefit of payment of debts due to them at pre-war rate of exchange.

This can be achieved by modifying the French text as follows:—

Replace "existent d'une part entre le Gouvernement ottoman ou ses ressortissants"

line 3 by "Dues par le Gouvernement ottoman ou ses ressortissants."

Suppress the words from "et résident" in line 7 to "industrie au Turquie" in line 9.

Foreign Office has written to High Commissioner despatch No. 230 of the 6th March, 1922, that they intend to press this modification, which my French and Italian colleagues oppose in the supposed interest of their banks.

Article 307. Revision of judgments, including those in real property, is proposed. The Mixed Arbitral Commission now that the Arbitral Commission of the League of Nations, contemplated in article 287, is washed out.

Article 308. If the Turks object to this article, as they certainly will, the concession may be made to them of giving jurisdiction to the Mixed Judicial Commission.

8975]

2 x

Articles 310, 316, 317, 417. Important to maintain.
Article 426. Add paragraph as follows.

"Cet article s'applique notamment aux arrêts, jugements et condamnations prononcées par les conseils de guerre et tribunaux militaires alliés auxquelles le Gouvernement ottoman déclare reconnaître la valeur de chose jugée."

Some provision should be inserted in the treaty to assure to Allied companies the right to carry on their business, and to Allied schools the right to work in Turkey

A. T. WAUGH

May 16, 1922

Enclosure 2 in No. 135.

Minutes of Inter-Allied Juridical Commission.

(Extract)

Session of 3 May 1922

II.—Étude du Traité de Sévres.

M. CILLIÈRE rappelle à la commission que les Hauts-Commissaires ont reconnu l'intérêt dans les circonstances actuelles, en vue d'une révision partielle du Traité de Sévres, d'un nouvel examen des articles de ce traité concernant les questions juridiques et qu'ils ont chargé la commission de procéder à un échange de vues à ce sujet. Il propose de commencer cette étude, qui exigera plusieurs conférences de la commission. La proposition est approuvée et la commission commence la lecture des articles du traité susceptibles de retenir son attention.

Mention sera faite au procès-verbal seulement des questions donnant lieu à des observations.

Article 49.—Régime des Détroits.

Mr Waugh rappelle cette question. Il s'agit du jugement des infractions au régime des détroits.

M. Cillière fait observer que les questions qui pourraient se poser à ce propos dépendent du régime qui sera définitivement adopté pour les détroits. Il semble donc préférable d'en ajourner la discussion. La commission approuve ce point de vue. En principe elle ne fait d'ailleurs pas d'objections au maintien de cet article. Si des objections sont soulevées, elles le seront sans doute du côté ottoman.

Article 121.—Nationalité

Cet article prévoit que les ressortissants ottomans établis sur les territoires cédés deviendront de plein droit ressortissants de l'Etat qui acquiert le territoire.

M. Cillière constate que dans cet article il n'est pas question des individus originaires des territoires cédés résidant et continuant à résider en Turquie hors des territoires cédés. Dans le silence du traité à cet égard on ne peut que conclure au maintien de leur nationalité ottomane. Or, beaucoup de Syriens, d'Albanais ou de Mésopotamiens restés à Constantinople croient qu'ils auront droit après la paix et sans changement de résidence à la nationalité syrienne, albanaise ou mésopotamienne. En réalité, dans le silence du traité, ils restent Ottomans.

La commission décide d'attirer l'attention des Hauts-Commissaires sur ce point, à titre d'ailleurs de simple constatation, cette situation étant conforme aux principes généraux du droit international.

Article 128.—Nationalité

Il s'agit de savoir si les biens des ressortissants ottomans établis sur les territoires cédés et appartenant à des personnes physiques ou morales, qui ont été confisqués ou qui ont été saisis par les autorités ottomanes, doivent être restitués à leurs propriétaires ou à leurs héritiers, ou s'ils doivent être attribués à l'Etat qui acquiert le territoire. La commission décide de se reporter à la note adressée précédemment aux Gouvernements alliés sur cette question, qu'elle examinera alors de plus près.

ce article soulève certainement l'opposition très vive et très légitime des légats

Il faut que les juifs établis en Palestine prennent de plein droit la nationalité palestinienne. Cet article, s'il est pris à la lettre, aurait pour conséquence qu'un juif qui se convertit à l'islamisme perdrait sa nationalité palestinienne. La commission ne peut que signaler cette conséquence.

Article 136

La commission, en raison de l'importance de cet article, décide d'en ajourner la discussion.

Article 144.—Protection des Minorités.

Il prévoit un certain nombre de commissions arbitrales nommées par le Conseil de la Société des Nations pour aviser à la réparation des dommages causés aux

M. Cillière rappelle à la commission qu'elle a déjà formulé des observations et présenté des propositions concernant l'application des articles 142 et 144, propositions et observations que les Hauts-Commissaires ont transmises avec avis favorable aux Gouvernements alliés. Depuis cette époque, le Gouvernement d'Angora a protesté contre les dispositions du Traité de Sévres concernant les minorités. De deux choses l'une, ou ces dispositions seront supprimées ou elles seront maintenues, et dans ce dernier cas la commission a déjà formulé son avis. Il ne semble pas qu'il y ait lieu, dans ces conditions, d'examiner de nouveau la question. La commission se range à ce point de vue. Toutefois, M. Galli estime qu'il y a lieu de rappeler aux Gouvernements alliés la situation de leurs ressortissants qui ont subi des pertes du fait des mesures appliquées contre les Arméniens.

M. Cillière rappelle que les Hauts-Commissaires ont déjà entretenu les Gouvernements alliés de cette question, dont le Traité de Sévres ne s'est pas occupé. Il y a en la, pour de nombreux ressortissants alliés, des dommages indirects mais certains, dont il serait juste qu'ils puissent être remboursés.

La commission est d'accord pour estimer que cette question très importante n'a pas été suffisamment étudiée. Elle décide de se reporter à la note adressée précédemment aux Gouvernements alliés sur cette question, qu'elle examinera alors de plus près.

M. Cillière propose de renvoyer cette question pour l'examiner plus à fond. Il semble qu'elle devra être séparée de celle des dommages de guerre ordinaires. Il signale à ce propos que les Gouvernements alliés viennent d'admettre que la Turquie n'aurait à payer qu'une somme globale, ce qui exclurait le paiement direct par le Gouvernement ottoman de tel ou tel dommage particulier.

Mr Waugh donne lecture à ce propos du procès-verbal de la Conférence de Paris prévoyant la somme globale qui devra être payée par les Turcs et l'institution d'une commission de liquidation.

Revenant à la question des dommages indirects subis par les ressortissants alliés par suite du massacre et de la liquidation des biens de leurs représentants arméniens, et tenant de côté pour le moment les dommages de guerre dont elle s'occupera au chapitre des réparations, la commission, sur l'avis de M. Galli, décide d'étudier l'attribution aux ressortissants alliés d'un droit de suite sur les biens de leurs détenteurs arméniens. M. Cillière observe que ce droit de suite même serait peu efficace, car, dans la plupart des cas, les biens auront disparu et auront été liquidés à bas prix. M. Galli fait observer qu'on ne peut admettre cependant que le Gouvernement ottoman soit tenu de rembourser les créances alliées de certains débiteurs pouvant être insolvables au moment de leur mort. Il faudra que le réclamant prouve qu'il restait à ce moment de quoi satisfaire sa créance.

Après un échange de vues, la commission décide de se reporter à la note adressée précédemment aux Gouvernements alliés sur cette question, qu'elle examinera alors de plus près.

Articles 226 à 230.—Sanctions.

Ces articles prévoient le jugement des coupables de guerre par les tribunaux alliés.

La commission constate que ces questions dépassent sa compétence et affectent un caractère plus politique que juridique. Vis-à-vis de l'Allemagne des clauses identiques n'ont pas été appliquées.

II.—*Traité de Sévres.*

La commission, reprenant l'étude du Traité de Sévres, commence par l'examen des clauses financières.

Articles 231 et suivants.

L'article 231 du Traité de Sévres dispose que la Turquie a été responsable de tous les dommages de guerre causés aux Alliés. La commission examine les dispositions relatives à la procédure de réclamation.

M. Cillié déclare que le Haut-Commissariat de France a reçu des centaines de réclamations dont le montant s'élève à des sommes considérables. Ces réclamations n'ont pas fait l'objet d'un examen à fond, qui est naturellement réservé à la future Commission arbitrale. Le Haut-Commissariat s'est borné à veiller, autant qu'il l'a pu, à ce que les demandes soient clairement exprimées et appuyées d'indications de nature à permettre leur vérification, le moment venu.

M. Cillié expose ensuite les dispositions relatives aux dommages de guerre causés aux Alliés par la Turquie. Il indique que le Haut-Commissariat de France a transmis à la Commission arbitrale les réclamations des Alliés.

M. Cillié déclare que le Gouvernement français a transmis à la Commission arbitrale les réclamations des Alliés.

De son côté, Mr. Waugh déclare que le Gouvernement anglais s'est borné jusqu'à présent à transmettre au Gouvernement allemand les réclamations de dommages de guerre contre la Turquie. M. Cillié déclare que le Gouvernement français a transmis à la Commission arbitrale les réclamations des Alliés.

Après un échange de vues, la commission ne peut que constater la nécessité de renvoyer, à la suite des nouvelles décisions des Gouvernements alliés, les articles du Traité de Sévres concernant les réparations et elle émet le vœu que les mesures adoptées permettent la réparation aussi complète que possible des dommages de guerre considérables subis en Turquie par les ressortissants alliés.

*Clauses économiques.—Relations commerciales.**Article 261.*

Cet article prévoit le rétablissement des privilèges capitulaires au profit des Puissances alliées qui en bénéficiaient directement ou indirectement avant le 1^{er} août 1914. Cette mesure, trop libérale peut-être, en faveur de ces dernières Puissances augmentera beaucoup les difficultés de la future réforme judiciaire, puisqu'aux termes de l'article 136, les Puissances capitulaires alliées ou neutres devront être consultées pour cette réforme. Cet article vise-t-il les nouvelles Puissances capitulaires?

Mr. Waugh donne lecture des dernières propositions faites à ce sujet par les Premiers Ministres des Gouvernements alliés dans leur récente réunion à Paris. On n'y envisage que les anciennes Puissances capitulaires. Malgré tout, la commission pense qu'il y aurait inconvénient à établir en faveur de toutes les Puissances alliées les privilèges capitulaires sans limiter et préciser cette attribution. Elle se réserve d'examiner de nouveau la question.

Article 262.—Postes étrangères.

Cet article prévoit le rétablissement des bureaux de postes en faveur des Puissances qui les possédaient avant la guerre. La commission constate la sagesse de cette mesure.

Articles 265 et 267.—Marques de Commerce.

Ces deux articles édictent un certain nombre de mesures destinées à protéger les produits alliés contre la concurrence déloyale.

La commission réserve cet article pour un examen plus approfondi avec la loi turque que M. Galli se procurera en même temps qu'une loi ottomane récente sur la propriété littéraire.

Article 269 et suivants.—Conventions internationales.

Ces articles énumèrent limitativement les conventions internationales qui sont restées en vigueur.

Article 271.

Duquel chacune des Puissances alliées a le droit de notifier à la Porte les conventions bilatérales avec la Turquie qu'elles désiraient faire revivre.

La commission estime qu'il n'y a rien à changer à ces divers articles.

Article 272.

L'un des articles, les Puissances alliées font valoir que de tous les traités et conventions conclus entre la Russie et la Turquie, il en est de même des traités entre la Turquie et la Roumanie, après le 15 août 1916. Ces articles ont surtout

la Russie la faculté d'accéder au traité dès qu'elle fera partie de la Société des Nations l'as d'observations à faire.

Propriété littéraire, industrielle et artistique.

La commission décide d'examiner ces articles en même temps que la loi turque sur les marques de fabrique.

Droits et Intérêts.

Ces articles sont très importants, mais ils devraient être entièrement modifiés par les récentes décisions des Gouvernements alliés.

Article 287.

Cet article impose la restitution de leurs biens aux ressortissants alliés. Il devra dans la forme subir d'importantes modifications par suite des récentes décisions des Puissances alliées, en ce qui concerne notamment la Commission arbitrale qui devra être désignée par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Le dernier paragraphe appelle une observation. M. Galli fait remarquer que ce paragraphe établit la non responsabilité du Gouvernement ottoman pour tous les dommages causés aux biens, droits et intérêts depuis le 30 octobre 1918 en territoire soumis à l'occupation effective des Puissances alliées, et détachés de la Turquie par le traité. Ne peut-on pas en conclure, par un raisonnement à contrario qu'il a lieu de

La question est d'ailleurs plutôt théorique que d'un intérêt pratique, puisque la Turquie n'aura désormais à payer qu'une somme forfaitaire.

Mr. Waugh expose alors que, d'après les renseignements reçus par le Haut-Commissariat britannique concernant les décisions de la réunion à Paris, la Turquie devrait payer 5,000,000. par an pendant vingt ans à une commission de liquidation.

Article 295 et suivants.

Ces articles prévoient la liquidation des biens des États ennemis et de leurs ressortissants. M. Cillié signale que l'on a laissé au Gouvernement ottoman le soin

avec les autres Puissances ennemies. Il est nécessaire à ce titre et il y a lieu de le maintenir.

Article 307

Cet article prévoit le remboursement de leurs dettes au taux du change d'avant guerre aux ressortissants alliés qui ne résident pas en Turquie et qui n'y exercent pas une industrie.

Mr. Waugh est d'avis qu'il y aurait lieu de supprimer cette réserve et d'étendre le bénéfice du change d'avant guerre aux ressortissants alliés même résidant en Turquie. C'est, dit-il, l'appréciation du Gouvernement anglais qui fera une proposition à ce sujet.

M. Cilière et M. Galli font ressortir que ce serait modifier le principe admis présent par les Puissances alliées en ce qui concerne les modifications juridiques subies en pays ennemis par les personnes qui y résident, en ce qui concerne notamment le cours forcé, et remettre en question toutes les opérations effectuées ce jour entre ressortissants alliés et ottomans, établissements financiers auxquels les Puissances alliées n'ont apporté

Waugh objecte qu'il est inadmissible que des commerçants dont on a exigé les marchandises soient remboursés en papier.

Cilière et M. Galli croient que la question est différente et qu'il n'est pas question d'accepter ainsi les évaluations des Turcs. Une commission appréciera la valeur réelle des marchandises et en ordonnera le remboursement à cette valeur, calculée au taux du jour du paiement. Mais si on admettait la solution à laquelle il vient d'être fait allusion, ce serait un bouleversement économique qui aurait les plus graves répercussions.

Article 308

Cet article interdit à la Turquie toute action ou réclamation contre le Gouvernement allié ou les Puissances alliées en raison d'actes ou de mesures de guerre.

Mr. Waugh donne lecture d'une lettre du Général Harrington exposant la nécessité de prendre dans le futur traité des dispositions pour protéger les officiers alliés contre des réclamations concernant leurs actes à Constantinople pendant l'armistice et contre les procès qui pourraient leur être intentés par exemple par des Turcs.

Après un échange de vues, la commission estime qu'il y a lieu de retenir les suggestions du Général Harrington et d'ajouter les mots "et d'armistice" après les mots "mesures exceptionnelles de guerre," à la fin de l'article 300, pour étendre à la période d'armistice les dispositions de cet article qui concernent seulement la période de guerre.

Article 307 — Contrats, Prescriptions et Jugements

Cet article prescrit la révision des jugements rendus pendant la guerre contre les ressortissants alliés. La partie lésée pourra demander une indemnité à la Commission arbitrale.

Cet article devra être renoncé puisqu'il faut envisager la disparition de la Commission arbitrale. Mr. Waugh estime qu'en tout cas il faudrait maintenir la révision des jugements par une Commission arbitrale.

M. Cilière rappelle que les Hauts-Commissaires ont soulevé autrefois les Gouvernements alliés de cette question très importante de la révision des jugements ottomans rendus pendant la guerre contre les Alliés. Il donne lecture de la lettre adressée à ce sujet au Gouvernement français le 17 janvier 1920 transmettant des propositions identiques des Hauts-Commissaires aux Gouvernements alliés. Il donne également

être reprises si la Commission arbitrale vient décidément à être supprimée.

La Commission reviendra sur cette question.

Article 308

Cet article prévoit que toutes les questions relatives à des contrats conclus avant la guerre en vigueur du traité entre des ressortissants alliés et des Ottomans seront jugées par les tribunaux alliés à l'exclusion des tribunaux ottomans.

La commission estime que le Gouvernement ottoman s'élèvera énergiquement contre cette disposition qui s'étend non seulement aux Puissances capitulaires, mais à toutes les Puissances alliées et même aux nouveaux Etats détachés de l'Empire ottoman. Elle se réserve de revenir sur cette question.

Article 309

A propos de l'article 309, Mr. Waugh donne lecture d'une lettre du Général Harrington demandant qu'on insère dans le traité une disposition prévoyant l'exécution des peines prononcées par les tribunaux alliés.

M. Cilière reconnaît le bien-fondé de cette observation, mais rappelle que les Hauts-Commissaires ont déjà signalé cette nécessité aux Gouvernements alliés au moment où la juridiction pénale militaire interalliée a été établie.

La commission examinera plus complètement la question à une prochaine séance.

Annexe, Article 2

Cet article établit que les contrats conclus restent en vigueur, sauf au cas où leur exécution entraînerait pour une des parties un préjudice trop considérable. Dans ce cas la Commission arbitrale pourra allouer à la partie lésée une indemnité à titre de réparation.

La commission estime que le jugement de ces affaires devrait le plus possible être confié à la Commission judiciaire mixte prévue au cas où disparaîtrait la Commission arbitrale.

Annexe, Article 4. — Gages

Cet article autorise la vente des gages effectuée par un créancier de bonne foi. Le créancier doit donner avis au propriétaire et s'il a pris seulement "les soins et les précautions nécessaires." La commission estime que cet article sous sa forme actuelle pourrait permettre des abus. Elle pense qu'il y aurait intérêt à le supprimer au raison de la grande extension des prêts sur gages en Turquie, et des facilités que cet article dans l'impossibilité de recourir à un jugement avant de vendre son gage.

SEANCE DU 8 Mai 1922

VI. — Traité de Sévres.

Question des Minorités

Mr. Waugh communique à la commission, d'après les renseignements reçus du Gouvernement anglais, les décisions adoptées à Paris concernant la protection des minorités.

Il a été décidé à la Conférence de Paris d'insérer dans le futur traité avec la Turquie les dispositions concernant les minorités contenues dans le traité avec la Grèce, le 10 août 1920. Il a été prévu également la constitution d'une commission interalliée pour assurer des garanties spéciales aux populations chrétiennes d'Asie Mineure.

Puissances alliées. La Société des Nations s'assurera de leur exécution et pourra dans ce but envoyer des délégués à Smyrne et dans certaines autres villes.

Mr. Waugh donne lecture de la proposition de la Conférence de Paris.

Une commission de liquidation serait constituée à laquelle les Turcs devraient verser 5,000,000,000 par an et affecter certains revenus tels que les excédents des douanes, de

Une commission serait constituée pour la révision des Capitulations fiscales. Elle établira l'égalité financière entre les Turcs et les étrangers, mais veillera à éviter des impositions exagérées. Une commission sera également nommée pour étudier la réforme de l'impôt sur le revenu. La dette publique sera maintenue. Les délégués allemands et autrichiens à la Dette publique seront supprimés. Les pays détachés de l'Empire ottoman contribueront à la Dette publique.

Article 144

Revenant à la protection des minorités et à l'article 144 du Traité de Sévres, la commission constate que cet article prévoit dans certaines conditions la restitution

on l'attribution des propriétés liquidées en application de la loi sur les envahissements.

La Commission a examiné les propositions relatives aux chrétiens ottomans victimes de la loi envahissements dont elle s'est déjà occupée et qui d'ailleurs se présente dans des conditions nouvelles. Elle s'occupe spécialement des propriétés des Arméniens et dont les biens ont été liquidés.

La Commission a également examiné les propositions relatives aux Gouvernements alliés au sujet de la loi des envahissements.

La Commission a déjà admis l'institution d'un droit de suite accordé au créancier ottoman.

M. Cailher suggère que le droit de suite des créanciers des Arméniens soit attribué au Gouvernement ottoman en laissant à celui-ci la charge de la preuve.

La Commission a également examiné les propositions relatives aux propriétés des Arméniens.

M. Cailher a également examiné les propositions relatives aux propriétés des Arméniens.

M. Cailher a également examiné les propositions relatives aux propriétés des Arméniens.

M. Cailher a également examiné les propositions relatives aux propriétés des Arméniens.

M. Cailher a également examiné les propositions relatives aux propriétés des Arméniens.

M. Cailher a également examiné les propositions relatives aux propriétés des Arméniens.

Sociétés et Concessions.

Article 310.

Cet article prévoit le renouvellement des contrats conclus entre l'Etat ottoman et les particuliers ou sociétés étrangères.

La Commission estime qu'il y a lieu de maintenir cet article en tenant compte des modifications nouvelles et en particulier à la disposition de la Commission financière.

Article 316.

Cet article prévoit le droit de passer leurs droits à une autre société de nationalité alliée.

La Commission pense qu'il y aurait grand intérêt à maintenir cet article.

Article 317.

Cet article définit le terme de "ressortissants alliés".

La Commission a également examiné les propositions relatives aux ressortissants alliés.

Mr. Waugh demande si cet article prévoit que les ressortissants de pays de protectorat des Puissances alliées, comme les Arméniens, jouissent des mêmes droits.

La Commission pense qu'il y aurait intérêt à maintenir cet article.

La Commission pense qu'il y aurait intérêt à maintenir cet article.

La Commission pense qu'il y aurait intérêt à maintenir cet article.

La Commission pense qu'il y aurait intérêt à maintenir cet article.

La Commission pense qu'il y aurait intérêt à maintenir cet article.

La Commission pense qu'il y aurait intérêt à maintenir cet article.

La Commission pense qu'il y aurait intérêt à maintenir cet article.

La Commission pense qu'il y aurait intérêt à maintenir cet article.

La Commission pense qu'il y aurait intérêt à maintenir cet article.

La Commission estime que le mot "recommandation" employé ici est trop faible et devrait être remplacé par le texte suivant :

"Les mesures qui seront reconnues justes et nécessaires par les Puissances alliées."

Article 426.

Cet article oblige la Turquie à reconnaître les jugements rendus en Turquie par des juridictions alliées et à en assurer l'exécution. La Commission croit que cet article suffirait pour obliger les Turcs à reconnaître la juridiction militaire pénale interalliée. Mais, comme cette disposition avait été insérée dans le Traité de Sèvres avant l'institution de la juridiction dont il s'agit, elle pense qu'il est préférable de préciser cette obligation explicitement, par exemple par l'adjonction suivante :

"Cette disposition s'appliquera notamment aux jugements et arrêts rendus par les Conseils de Guerre et Tribunaux militaires interalliés ainsi qu'aux condamnations prononcées par eux pendant la période en-dehors indiquée."

Sociétés alliées et à Capital allié en Turquie.

La Commission revient ensuite à l'examen des conditions dans lesquelles fonctionnent en Turquie les sociétés alliées ou à capitaux alliés.

M. Cailher donne lecture à ce sujet d'une lettre adressée le 21 février 1920 par le Haut Commissariat de France au Ministère des Affaires étrangères français, ainsi que de la note collective qui y était annexée et qui avait pour objet de signaler la nécessité d'accorder aux sociétés alliées ou à capitaux alliés et aux commerçants la faculté d'employer la langue de leur choix dans leurs écritures et à avoir à leur service des employés de toute nationalité.

La Commission pense que cet article pourrait être inséré aux clauses diverses, entre l'article 419 et 420 et pourrait être ainsi conçu :

"Les commerçants alliés ainsi que les sociétés alliées ou à capitaux alliés auront en Turquie le droit de leur langue et leur comptabilité dans la langue de leur choix et d'employer à leur service du personnel de toute nationalité. La Turquie s'engage à modifier dans ce sens toutes les dispositions législatives contraires qui auraient pu être prises par elle."

Droits des Ressortissants alliés dans les Successions ottomanes.

M. Cailher donne également lecture d'une lettre adressée le 16 octobre 1919 par le Haut Commissariat de France au Ministère des Affaires étrangères français pour signaler la situation des femmes ottomanes ayant épousé des étrangers et que la loi ottomane prive de leurs droits successoraux. Il rappelle que les Hauts-Commissaires ont été chargés de faire connaître cette situation aux Puissances alliées pour mettre fin à cette injuste situation et d'insérer dans le futur Traité de Paix un article ainsi conçu :

"Les ressortissants alliés dont la législation admet les ressortissants ottomans à prendre part à la succession au même titre que les nationaux jouiront en Turquie des mêmes droits dans la succession de leurs parents ottomans."

En posant la question sur le terrain de la réciprocité on prévient sans doute les objections qui pourraient être faites.

Écoles alliées en Turquie

La Commission revient ensuite à l'examen des conditions dans lesquelles fonctionnent en Turquie les écoles alliées ou à capitaux alliés. Elle rappelle que la loi turque sur les écoles étrangères qui a été promulguée pendant la guerre a été modifiée par la loi de 1919. La Commission a également examiné les propositions relatives aux écoles alliées et a décidé de maintenir la loi de 1919. La Commission a également examiné les propositions relatives aux écoles alliées et a décidé de maintenir la loi de 1919.

SEANCE DU 10 MAI 1922.

IV.—*Traité de Secrec.**Ecoles alliées en Turquie.*

M. Galli donne lecture de la loi turque du 20 août 1911 sur les écoles étrangères.

Article 1^{er}

(Pour toute école la reconnaissance de l'Etat est nécessaire.)

Article 2

Cet article interdit aux communautés, associations et sociétés étrangères d'ouvrir une école.

Article 3.

L'acte que les particuliers étrangers ne pourront ouvrir une école que s'il y a suffisamment de habitants de leur nationalité pour en justifier la création. En outre, la réciprocité est en jeu.

La commission constate que ces dispositions violent tous les privilèges établis des étrangers et sont absolument inacceptables. Elle estime qu'il y aurait lieu d'insérer dans le traité, par exemple aux clauses diverses, après l'article 419, un article constatant que les communautés, associations et sociétés alliées pourront ouvrir des écoles.

librement l'enseignement comme, d'ailleurs, toute profession ou le Gouvernement turc s'engage, dans les six mois qui suivront la mise en vigueur du traité, à conformer sa législation à cette clause du

Néanmoins, la commission estime que les Turcs pour certaines garanties comme l'enseignement du turc ou l'application de certaines mesures concernant la salubrité publique.

L'étude de cette question délicate pourrait être confiée à une commission alliée, où figureraient des délégués ottomans.

Propriété industrielle, littéraire et artistique.

M. Galli donne lecture de la loi turque sur les droits d'auteur. M. Cillière observe que cette question, ainsi que celle des marques de fabrique, dispositions établies par les Puissances alliées vis-à-vis de

et qu'il y a là tout un système juridique arrêté par les Puissances alliées qui ne peut sans doute être modifié. Il croit que la seule question qui importe en l'espèce est celle de la juridiction à laquelle seront attribuées les affaires en matière de contrefaçon. Il fait à ce propos un exposé de la loi ottomane sur les marques de commerce et de fabrique et donne lecture de certaines notes personnelles recueillies par lui sur cette

affaires, soit en matière pénale, soit en matière civile, par les tribunaux purement

des étrangers le bénéfice de la loi sur les marques de fabrique et de commerce. Il ne semble pas que depuis lors la situation se soit modifiée. Les Gouvernements alliés ont probablement entendu édicter une législation uniforme dans tous les traités et ne voudront pas admettre qu'elle soit modifiée.

La commission approuvant cette manière de voir estime qu'il y a lieu de rappeler aux Gouvernements alliés qu'ils n'ont pas accepté les lois turques sur cette question

actuelles du traité un article les mettant en conformité avec le régime judiciaire qui sera adopté après la guerre.

M. Cillière pense qu'il y a lieu de mentionner, dans le traité de paix, les

avec les garanties capitulaires et par conséquent avec le régime de l'Etat. Quant aux actions en dommages-intérêts, il serait opportun de les déférer actuellement à la Commission judiciaire mixte provisoire.

Quand la réforme judiciaire sera établie, il serait utile de déférer toutes ces affaires, — entre Ottomans et étrangers d'une même nationalité à une seule et même juridiction, afin d'établir en cette matière si importante une unité de jurisprudence. La future juridiction mixte sera toute désignée pour en connaître.

Articles 266 et 267

La commission propose de supprimer ces deux articles et de les remplacer par un seul article qui serait le suivant : « Les affaires en matière de contrefaçon, de droits de propriété industrielle, littéraire et artistique, seront déférées à la Commission judiciaire mixte provisoire, avec les garanties capitulaires, soit à la Commission judiciaire mixte provisoire actuelle, si elle était maintenue, de façon à éviter les difficultés qui se présenteraient avant la guerre. Les pénalités seront appliquées par les tribunaux correctionnels ottomans avec l'assistance du drogman et la question des dommages portée devant la Commission judiciaire mixte. »

Article 134.—Réforme judiciaire et Capitulations.

Cet article prévoit la nomination d'une commission de quatre membres, nommée par l'Italie, l'Angleterre, la France et le Japon pour étudier la réforme judiciaire, avec concours d'experts techniques des autres Puissances capitulaires. Faut-il entendre par les mots : « autres Puissances capitulaires » les anciennes Puissances capitulaires alliées seules, ou toutes celles auxquelles le bénéfice des Capitulations est accordé par l'article 261 ? La commission estime qu'il ne faut appeler à cette discussion que les

les Puissances de la « petite Entente » et la Pologne font des difficultés pour venir devant la Commission judiciaire mixte telle qu'elle est constituée et émettent la prétention d'y être représentées par des juges de leur

il y aurait lieu de remplacer les mots : « les autres Puissances capitulaires » par les mots : « les autres Puissances capitulaires d'avant-guerre, alliées » et au troisième paragraphe les mots : « les personnes intéressées » par « les personnes

Article 261

Conformément à l'avis ci-dessus émis par la commission, Mr. Waugh propose de supprimer la fin de l'article 261 ainsi conçu : « Le bénéfice en sera étendu à celles qui n'en jouissaient pas au 1^{er} août 1914 ».

La commission croit que les Turcs s'opposeraient énergiquement à cette extension et que celle-ci est contraire au véritable intérêt des principales Puissances alliées. Si cependant celles-ci croyaient devoir maintenir cette disposition, il faudrait spécifier que ce régime serait provisoire seulement jusqu'à la mise en vigueur de la réforme judiciaire et sans qu'elle puisse constituer un droit acquis par les Puissances alliées dont il s'agit.

Les Etats-Unis et le futur Traité.

M. Cillière déclare alors avoir reçu la visite de Mr. Bayndal, consul général des Etats-Unis, délégué par l'Amiral Bristol pour le représenter à la Commission juridique. Quand se présenteront des questions susceptibles de toucher à un intérêt américain. Dans la conversation qu'ils ont eue tous deux sur le régime judiciaire à instituer en Turquie, M. Bayndal a exprimé l'avis que, même en matière pénale, une juridiction mixte. Il a à cette occasion suggéré l'intérêt qu'il aurait à être tenu au courant des dispositions des Hauts-Commissaires américains pour pouvoir satisfaire à cette demande. La commission estime que les Hauts-Commissaires seuls pourraient prendre une décision à ce sujet, mais elle ne croit pas qu'il soit opportun de mêler les Américains à la revision d'un traité duquel les Etats-Unis ne sont pas partie.

SEANCE DU 13 MAI 1922.

II.—*Traité de Secrec.*

Article 307.

Mr. Waugh fait observer que, d'après le procès-verbal du 6 mai, il avait été décidé de revenir sur cet article qui prévoit la revision des jugements rendus pendant la guerre contre des Alliés par des tribunaux ottomans. La Commission arbitrale prévue par l'article 287 devant être supprimée et remplacée par une commission de liquidation qui ne semble pas avoir des pouvoirs judiciaires, il propose qu'au cas où la Commission arbitrale serait supprimée, elle soit remplacée par la Commission judiciaire mixte provisoire. La commission se range à cet avis. Elle estime qu'au cas où la Commission de Liquidation n'aurait pas les pouvoirs judiciaires, la solution la meilleure serait de confier la revision des jugements à la Commission judiciaire mixte provisoire. Toutefois, au cas où cette disposition serait jugée impossible, les Haute-Commissaires jugeraient sans doute opportun de rappeler aux Gouvernements alliés les propositions antérieures qu'ils leur ont adressées sur ce sujet d'après l'avis de la Commission juridique.

Article 261.—*Rétablissement des Capitulations*

Mr. Waugh expose qu'il a l'honneur de vous adresser ci-joint la conclusion des travaux de la Commission juridique.

Il a l'honneur de vous adresser également ci-joint un rapport sur les travaux de la Commission juridique, ainsi qu'un rapport sur les travaux de la Commission judiciaire mixte provisoire.

E 5488 19 44]

No. 136

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 29)

(No. 465.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 23, 1922.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 241, I have the honour to report that the local press during the last two days has referred to a telegram reported to have been sent by Miss Billings, described as the head of the American Near East Relief Agency at Angora, to the effect that the reports of massacres of Christians by the Kemalists at Kharpout are devoid of foundation. It is not clear to whom this telegram was addressed, and I learn from Dr. Kennedy, who is in close touch with the American Near East Relief Association, that the telegram was not received by the headquarters of that association here. It is conjectured that Miss Billings may have telegraphed to Admiral Bristol over the head of the American Near East Relief. However that may be, I am informed confidentially that the American Near East Relief have a poor opinion of Miss Billings's reliability.

It is to be observed that Miss Billings's telegram alludes to massacres of Christians, whereas the charges brought against the Turks are for deportations.

I have, &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,

High Commissioner.

E 5488 19 44]

No. 137

Sir H. Rumbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 29.)

(No. 466.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 23, 1922.

THE news of the strong line taken by His Majesty's Government in the matter of the persecution of Christians in Asia Minor, reported by the American Near East Relief Association, has been widely reported in the local press. In view of the fact that the news reports on the subject, I have sought as far as possible to prevent the matter from being discussed in the local press.

His Majesty's Government's proposal for a joint enquiry. The French authorities were at first inclined to allow greater latitude to the Turkish press than seemed to be advisable, but on my pointing out that it would in that case be necessary to allow the Greek press to retort, and that newspaper polemic of a violent kind would only envenom the situation, General Pelle acquiesced in my views. In reporting on the impression created by Mr. Chamberlain's statements, I have in mind not only what has appeared in the press but what has been suppressed.

2. The Turkish Nationalist papers generally abound in denials that any atrocities have taken place, or could take place, in a country so well ordered as Anatolia.

The Turkish Nationalist papers generally abound in denials that any atrocities have taken place, or could take place, in a country so well ordered as Anatolia. whose activities have been a definite source of danger to the Kemalists army. The allegations of the Americans from Kharpout are set down to the vindictiveness of persons who quarrelled with the local authorities there, and who were legitimately expelled. Major Yowell is described as having bawled his allegations round Constantinople, and having failed to induce responsible Americans, including the official heads of the Near East Relief Organisation, or anyone else to take them seriously until he succeeded in making Mr. Graves, the "Times" correspondent, the instrument of his revenge. An appeal is made to the testimony of other Americans now in Asia Minor, and it is pointed out that the only person who has been made especially out of a telegram from a Near East relief lady-work, who is denying that there has been any massacre at Kharpout, or that anything happened there.

3. The papers are not slow to suggest that His Majesty's Government have lent a willing ear to calumnious accusations against the Kemalists for purely political reasons.

in the eyes of the world. Reference is made to alleged efforts in the past by the Tsarist Russian Government and by Mr. Gladstone to exploit a purely artificial minorities question to the detriment of Turkey. The French are getting the whole credit of the Greek occupied territory also. The Pan-Islamist "Tevhid-i Efkâr," in its issue of the 20th May, seizes the opportunity of contrasting the attitude of the French Government with that of Great Britain. Publicity is given to a Havana telegram for their misdeeds at Smyrna, Ionia and Chios.

In general, every effort is made to advertise real or alleged Greek atrocities, to which Europeans, now so ready to condemn Turkey on the strength of a single biased statement, have remained culpably indifferent.

4. The attitude of the Turkish press towards the proposal for investigation by a mixed commission varies a good deal. Some writers insist that Angora has nothing to hide, and that the treatment is given to Turks and Greeks. Some resent the proposal, as involving an illegitimate interference with Turkey's internal affairs. One paper, the "Yakut," whose editor is a Salonica Crypto Jew, formerly a student in the United States, points out that Turkey is at war with three of the Powers concerned, and suggests that, if any enquiry at all is necessary, it should be carried out by Americans only.

5. Local Greek writers are generally hostile to the proposal for investigation by a mixed commission. They insist that the treatment is given to Turks and Greeks.

Some resent the proposal, as involving an illegitimate interference with Turkey's internal affairs. One paper, the "Yakut," whose editor is a Salonica Crypto Jew, formerly a student in the United States, points out that Turkey is at war with three of the Powers concerned, and suggests that, if any enquiry at all is necessary, it should be carried out by Americans only.

6. The attitude of the Turkish press towards the proposal for investigation by a mixed commission varies a good deal. Some writers insist that Angora has nothing to hide, and that the treatment is given to Turks and Greeks.

Some resent the proposal, as involving an illegitimate interference with Turkey's internal affairs. One paper, the "Yakut," whose editor is a Salonica Crypto Jew, formerly a student in the United States, points out that Turkey is at war with three of the Powers concerned, and suggests that, if any enquiry at all is necessary, it should be carried out by Americans only.

7. The attitude of the Turkish press towards the proposal for investigation by a mixed commission varies a good deal. Some writers insist that Angora has nothing to hide, and that the treatment is given to Turks and Greeks.

Some resent the proposal, as involving an illegitimate interference with Turkey's internal affairs. One paper, the "Yakut," whose editor is a Salonica Crypto Jew, formerly a student in the United States, points out that Turkey is at war with three of the Powers concerned, and suggests that, if any enquiry at all is necessary, it should be carried out by Americans only.

8. The attitude of the Turkish press towards the proposal for investigation by a mixed commission varies a good deal. Some writers insist that Angora has nothing to hide, and that the treatment is given to Turks and Greeks.

Some resent the proposal, as involving an illegitimate interference with Turkey's internal affairs. One paper, the "Yakut," whose editor is a Salonica Crypto Jew, formerly a student in the United States, points out that Turkey is at war with three of the Powers concerned, and suggests that, if any enquiry at all is necessary, it should be carried out by Americans only.

9. The attitude of the Turkish press towards the proposal for investigation by a mixed commission varies a good deal. Some writers insist that Angora has nothing to hide, and that the treatment is given to Turks and Greeks.

Some resent the proposal, as involving an illegitimate interference with Turkey's internal affairs. One paper, the "Yakut," whose editor is a Salonica Crypto Jew, formerly a student in the United States, points out that Turkey is at war with three of the Powers concerned, and suggests that, if any enquiry at all is necessary, it should be carried out by Americans only.

10. The attitude of the Turkish press towards the proposal for investigation by a mixed commission varies a good deal. Some writers insist that Angora has nothing to hide, and that the treatment is given to Turks and Greeks.

Some resent the proposal, as involving an illegitimate interference with Turkey's internal affairs. One paper, the "Yakut," whose editor is a Salonica Crypto Jew, formerly a student in the United States, points out that Turkey is at war with three of the Powers concerned, and suggests that, if any enquiry at all is necessary, it should be carried out by Americans only.

of this document." The translation is evidently faulty in parts. It is the most violent utterance on the subject which has yet come to my notice. It has been suppressed by the military telegraphic censorship.

H. R.

[E 5489 19 44]

No. 138

Sir H. Humbold to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 20.)

(No. 471)

HIS Majesty's representative at Constantinople presents his compliments to His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and has the honour to transmit herewith copy of a despatch from Sir H. Lamb dated the 16th May, respecting Greek atrocities.

Constantinople, May 23, 1922.

Enclosure 1 in No. 138

Consul-General Sir H. Lamb to Sir H. Humbold

(No. 85.)

Sir,

Smyrna, May 16, 1922.

I HAVE had the honour to receive your Excellency's despatch No. 64 of the 4th May, transmitting for my observations a copy of a communication received from Yussuf Kemal Bey in regard to atrocities alleged to have been committed by the Greeks in occupied territory.

1. As your Excellency is aware, nothing is more difficult than to verify statements of this nature by any means short of a personal enquiry made by oneself or a trustworthy European agent on the spot.

2. I think, however, that it may safely be said that the statements contained in the communication received from Yussuf Kemal Bey are not without foundation. There can be no doubt that a considerable number of Turkish villages have been burned and many villagers killed in the course both of the regular military operations and of the pursuit of bands. Whether or not there has always been sufficient justification for such destruction is a matter on which it is impossible to express a definite opinion with the scanty information in our possession.

3. I have no information at all in regard to the specific instance of Ferendje mentioned in the second paragraph of the memorandum but I consider that the statements should be accepted with reserve.

4. Yussuf Kemal Bey was perhaps unwise in citing cases from localities quite so remote as Ferendje. It is a small village, situated in a suburb of this city, from which it is distant only about 5 miles by rail, and it is the habitual residence of a considerable number of British and other European families.

5. It is almost inconceivable that an outrage, such as that described in paragraph 10 of the memorandum, should have taken place there at the beginning of April and not have come to our ears by the middle of May.

6. The same remark would appear to apply to the incident reported in paragraph 11 of the memorandum. The description therein given, of a small pinewood, more commonly known as "telamnia," situated on the outskirts of the same suburb of Bourja and forming the object of a popular evening stroll for its inhabitants. It is, however, difficult to understand for what purpose twelve Mussulman butchers should have assembled there.

7. The statement that the Greeks should have "invaded" the Sokia district, on its evacuation by the Italians, "before it had been reconquered by the Turkish troops," but surely the admission that they had done so disposes of the subsequent accusation that they "burned the village" of those same troops, who had not yet appeared upon the scene.

I am, Sir, very respectfully, Your obedient servant,

* Not printed.

and Gumushkeui were burned and some inhabitants of the latter village killed by the advancing columns of the Greeks, whose excuse is that they were fired on by that portion of the population which fled at their approach. A Mussulman shrine, of some local importance, situated on the top of the ridge between Sokia and Scala Nuova, was desecrated and no doubt many other acts of destruction committed during the advance, but I have been assured by trustworthy British witnesses, who accompanied or closely followed the occupying force, that they saw not only no indication of unnecessary bloodshed, but even remarkably little looting in that area.

10. As regards the statements in paragraph 5 of the memorandum, I believe there is no doubt that the Armenians here have promised their co-operation to the National Defence Committee and I have heard that special corps of police or civic guards have been formed. The name mentioned has been here for some little time and has also paid one or two visits to Athens. I understand that he met at first with a somewhat cool reception, although he has the reputation of a brave man and a good soldier, he is regarded as something of an adventurer and does not carry much weight amongst his compatriots. His collaboration, however, now appears to have been accepted by the Committee.

I am, Sir, very respectfully, Your obedient servant,

HARRY H. LAMB

Enclosure 2 in No. 138.

The "Circle circle" of Magnesia.

A CORRESPONDENT writes to us from Magnesia:—

"Yesterday afternoon there took place at Bourja a military exercise of the Guard of Magnesia and also of the corps of hand grenade throwers which is in formation and who received from special office-instructors lessons in the use and methods of throwing of hand grenades, using both dummies and live bombs. Similar concentrations took place at Khosokreui and Mouradieh, where the civic guard carried out martial exercises in fighting order and with great success.

"At 4 P.M. the G.O.C. Northern Sector, Major-General Petrosian, accompanied by his Staff and by the Military Governor of Magnesia and his Staff, paid visits to the following their exercises, expressed himself as fully satisfied with the zeal and application of the men in training."

[E 5692 19 44]

No. 139

Sir H. Humbold to the Earl of Halifax.—(Received June 6.)

(No. 490. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, May 30, 1922.

IN amplification of my telegram No. 259 of the 27th instant, I have the honour to inform you that the "Boston Christian Science Monitor," describing the position at Trebizond, Dr. Gibbons explained that these letters, which are dated the 20th, have not had time to reach the paper to which they were addressed.

I am, Sir, very respectfully, Your obedient servant,

reason for which Mr Gillespie, commercial secretary at the American High Commission here, said M. Rousselle, French Consul General at Constantinople, had even sent a telegram to headquarters at Constantinople urging silence on Dr. Gibbon's part.

I have, &c.
HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Com. *see*

No. 140

telegram No. 200 of the
so placed at my disposal.
Christian Science Monitor,

Their first job was to make a hole in the wall.

They are
had the other
for "country"
are bitterly

opposed to Mustafa Kemal, because of his repressive methods, and because their one desire is to return to a quiet and peaceful life. Desertions from the Kemalist army across the Greek lines have been numerous, the deserters being mostly people from occupied territory. Turkish civilians have also crossed the lines seeking asylum from Kemalist oppression. Kemalism is a authority movement and means the rule of a gang just as much as the rule of Abdul Hamid's entourage or the Committee of Union and Progress. Western Turcoophiles who support Ataturk are mistaken in their ideas for it is the Turkish peasant who is the victim of the ~~Kemalist~~

6. Lastly, Dr. Gibbons writes very glowingly of the Greek military position. The Greeks hold a strong line, with excellent lines of communication in the rear, are well found in every way, and are far better, as regards moral, than Dr. Gibbons expects to find them. He is positive that the Greek army will be able to stand up to the Turkish army to leave Asia Minor. Moreover, the Greek force, and the army will obey the organisers of that force, and the army will be disposed to yield to the government, should the

7. Dr. Gibbons has shown me a number of letters, documents in Turkish and Greek, collected during his journey, containing resolutions of public meetings, speeches, &c., in support of the view that the Turks in Greek occupied territory should, and view with horror the prospect of the Kemalists. I also included the telegram from the anti Kemalist organisation at Brindisi to the Genoa Conference, a translation of which I enclosed in my despatch No. 44b of the 16th May, 1922. This is a fair sample of the whole.

5. While it is interesting to have these impressions first hand from an educated observer who has actually traversed the country, I feel that statements regarding the attitude of the Turk must be taken with great caution. The more conspicuous the Attilians interviewed are persons who have become identified with the Greeks. They are probably quite sincere in their dislike of the prospect of the Kemalists taking the country over, for it would almost certainly go hard with many of them. Thus they have a personal interest in not seeing the Greeks leave too quickly, but it is difficult to believe them equally sincere in their professions of a desire to see the Greeks permanently installed. Dr. Attilian's account of the feeling of the bulk of the Turkish population is doubtless correct. They are ground down under the Kemalists in Nationalist territory, and they have no interest in political developments apart from their effect on their immediate material interests. They have a traditional regard for the Sultan, but they are through all vicissitudes subservient instruments in the hands of whatever authority they are invested with real power over their persons and property.

I take this opportunity of enclosing two copies each of a letter and enclosure from General Harrington regarding anti-Konak activity in the Kona region. I have authorized Mr. Ryan to interview the persons referred to in General Harrington's letter without appearing to run after them or to encourage them. They have not yet responded to cautious intimation that they will be arrested if they call at the High Commission. It is for this reason that these documents have not hitherto been forwarded to your Lordship. I enclose them now as they are germane to the present subject. I regret that time does not admit of further copies being made in time for the King's messenger who will carry this despatch.

(4) I shall probably have occasion to address your Lordship later on this subject of the appeal from Konia, and a similar appeal which has been addressed to me (direct) by a considerable number of Turks professing to voice the anti Kemalist sentiments of the people. The only way in that, while such appeals prove the existence of elements definitely opposed to Kemalism, and may be taken into his own, it would be unwise to found on them any hope of seeing the power of Angora broken by a strong and united popular movement of opposition to it. In present circumstances the anti-Kemalist organizers do not dispose of the means of working up such a movement without some external backing. For the time being they are powerless. They would be a useful factor if in time the intransigence of the Kemalists should force the Allies or His Majesty's Government to take active measures to compass the destruction of the Angora Government and to re-establish the Sultan's authority.

HORACE R. MIBOLD, *High Commissioner.*

* Not printed.

S 5039 5 44]

No. 141

The Earl of Balfour to Lord Hordinge (Paris).

No. 1720.)

My Lord,

Foreign Office, June 7, 1922.

I HAVE to request you to communicate the enclosed memorandum to M. Poincaré in reply to his note of the 15th May, forwarded in your despatch No. 1177 of the 15th May.

Enclosure in No. 141

Memorandum.

HIS Majesty's Government have devoted considerable time to a most careful examination of the proposal contained in the French Government's note of the 15th May, and sincerely regret that they are unable to accept it. M. Poincaré's arguments have not prevailed against their previously stated objections to deferring to the demand of the Ankara Government.

It cannot be disputed that the proposed conference at or off land constitutes a radical departure in favour of the Turks from the plan agreed upon at the Paris Conference, violating both the letter and the spirit of the Allied offer.

The French Government will agree that this offer involved three separate and distinct stages: (a) conclusion of an armistice; (b) unequivocal acceptance of the body of the peace conditions, of which the evacuation of Smyrna formed an essential part; and (c) the meeting in conference of delegates representing Great Britain, France and Italy as well as Greece, the Sultan and Ankara, to discuss those conditions, with the view of reducing them to treaty form, such discussion permitting possible modifications of special points of detail but no concession of principle. The present position is that the Greek Government have accepted the armistice but not the conditions, while the Turkish Government of Constantinople have accepted nothing, but have returned evasive, if not defiant, answers to attempts to frustrate a settlement on the

Government regard the Paris Agreement as definite and binding on all parties. It appears at first sight to be a repudiation on the part of the French Government to accept the breach of that agreement implied in the Ankara proposal.

4. His Majesty's Government are quite unable to share M. Poincaré's optimistic conviction that direct contact at land would result in the acceptance of the Allied offer by all three parties concerned, nor can they assent to the view that a refusal to agree to a preliminary conference, which is much more likely to furnish the occasion for obstructive discussion than to promote international agreement, can render the Paris scheme more likely to succeed. If the Paris offer is refused either by the Greek or the Turkish Governments, the responsibility rests entirely with them.

5. To uphold the Paris scheme means to His Majesty's Government of supreme importance. Nothing has occurred since that scheme was agreed upon to alter the situation unless it be the deliberate attempt to exterminate the Greek population in Asia Minor recently brought to light by impartial witnesses. This disastrous policy renders it more than ever necessary to insist effectively on the protection of racial and religious minorities, an end which is likely now to prove exceedingly difficult of accomplishment unless the measures contemplated under the Paris scheme are carried out. It is, in part at least, because this unanimity has neither made itself felt by the

belligerents nor been obvious to all the world that the negotiations arising out of the Treaty of Sevres have been allowed to drag on till the delay has become something of a diplomatic scandal, and all Mohammedan lands bordering on the Eastern Mediterranean are kept in a state of permanent unrest. His Majesty's Government are confident that the French Government will agree with them in desiring that this unhappy state of things should be brought to a speedy close.

6. As things are at present, the immediate alternatives seem reduced to two:—

(a) A further communication to the three Governments of Greece, Constantinople and Ankara on the lines definitely agreed upon at Paris, reiterating the Allied offer and demanding a definite acceptance or refusal of it within a given period; or

(b) The resumption of the negotiations that has passed, on the one hand, between the Allied and the three belligerent Governments, and, on the other, between the Allied Governments themselves.

7. His Majesty's Government earnestly hope that M. Poincaré, recognising the force of their arguments, will accept the former alternative. Should he unfortunately find himself unable to do so, they feel satisfied that public opinion, at least in Great Britain, will absolve them from all responsibility for the failure of the Paris Conference in March last, and for the course which such failure must inevitably entail on the

Foreign Office, June 7, 1922.

E 5812 27 44]

No. 142

Director of Military Operations to Foreign Office.—(Received June 9.)

THE Director of Military Operations and Intelligence presents his compliments to the Secretary of State and has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the report of the interview between the Greek High Commissioner at Smyrna and the British liaison officer at Greek headquarters.

Major-General Sir William Morant thinks that this report may be of interest to the War Office.

War Office, June 8, 1922.

Enclosure in No. 142

Report on Greek Attitude towards Evacuation.

(Secret.)

THE following is a résumé of an interview given to Major Johnston by M. Sterghiadou, May 5, 1922:—

M. Sterghiadou had seen General Pallas and had urged on him the necessity of returning to headquarters at Smyrna, for as the High Commissioner's estimation the Chief of Staff was the man with the soundest opinion as to the general direction of the Greek army. General Pallas, however, had been forced to remain in Athens on account of the many technical questions which were cropping up at the War Ministry and which he alone was competent to answer. He was, however, coming back shortly.

The Greek-Turkish military situation appeared to be more or less at a standstill. From information at his private disposal and unconnected with the Military Intelligence Department, M. Sterghiadou was not contemplating a general attack, but that Mustafa Kemal was waiting a favourable opportunity for such an attack. This was due, not only to the fact that many of the men who have been given leave have not yet returned, but also because it was necessary for the army to be retrained on the crops on which the Nationalist army

and Italy

[8973]

2 x 3

Presumably in the last conference at Paris the decision given by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs was to bring about peace in the Near East, which pacification was an essential condition for the maintenance of the solidarity of real alliance by which, in the days after the armistice, they had imposed their will on a nation which future historians might proclaim to be the greatest the world had known. On account of this unity Germany had accepted every decision imposed upon her, for she saw against her the decided front of the Allies. She had given up her colonies, Alsace-Lorraine, Poland, Danzig and part of Silesia; agreed to the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary, which had in reality been a living limb of the German Empire; had accepted the disintegration of her naval and mercantile fleets; and had not refused to pay an almost impossible war indemnity.

Unfortunately this solidarity had ceased to exist, and the day of a settlement of the Near East problem was consequently still far off.

In answer to the question "Will the Greek army evacuate Asia Minor?" M. Sterghiadou replied as follows:

"Certainly, and with a great sense of relief, but with these two reservations: Firstly, Greece must have a sure guarantee that her army of 200,000 men in Asia Minor would leave the country without any mob-station on the part of Mustafa Kemal's forces, and secondly, that the security of the lives and property of the Christian inhabitants in the zone now occupied by the Greek army in Asia Minor."

"He would be an imbecile who would rely on the word of the Turk that these two conditions would be adhered to. In the first minor treaty made by the French with Mustafa Kemal the garrison of Marash had been taken. At the moment the effectives of the French forces in that area had been reduced to a few hundred men. The terms of the treaty, and from all accounts the treaty was not of the best. What could Greek troops or the Christian population of Asia Minor expect if the army evacuated without real guarantees for its security?"

While at Athens M. Sterghiadou had had conversations with all the Allied Ministers, and had asked each of them if adequate guarantees could be given for the two reservations he mentioned. The answer in each case had been that it was impossible. He had then pointed out that at the 1922 Conference of Lausanne the Allies who had recommended the security of the Christian population in Asia Minor, and the evacuation of the Greek army, had not been of the best.

He then pointed out that the evacuation of the Greek army, and the security of the Christian population in Asia Minor, had not been of the best. What could Greek troops or the Christian population of Asia Minor expect if the army evacuated without real guarantees for its security?"

The solution was this:

- Three Allied divisions should separate the Greek and Turkish armies to prevent the latter from molesting the Greek army in its withdrawal.
- Some régime should be constituted in a zone about Smyrna which would enable the Christian population to live there in peace.
- Neither Greek nor Turkish troops should be allowed in this zone, whose security would be maintained by a mixed gendarmerie.

With regard to (c) above, the precedent of Crete was analogous, for until Turkish troops entered the island the whole island quietened down at once.

The régime for the zone at (b) above must be such as to ensure the safety of the Christian population, not only for the moment, but for an indefinite future as well.

National Defence Movement.

M. Sterghiadou disapproved entirely of this in so far as it implied a separatist movement. In his opinion it was nothing but madness.

On account of his views on the subject he was by no means popular amongst his compatriots. One Greek newspaper had even referred to him as a second "Caillaud".

This was of small importance to him, as he was determined if possible to save the country from such imbecility.

A national defence movement, without mutual action with the State and the army, could do little against the Nationalist army. Once the Greek regular army left the country Mustafa Kemal would have a most enjoyable task in destroying completely an irregular national defence army.

What was more important still was that, although at present the Great Powers were comparatively neutral, Italy and France were only waiting for some such pretext as an insurrectional movement to step in and destroy Greece. He had, in fact, unrefusable evidence that the Italians with this end in view, and doubtless they would soon bring the French in with them.

That a few thousands of their subjects were in danger from a Greek irregular army would be sufficient ground for the Italians and French to land troops on the quay at Smyrna, and the Greek army at the front would then virtually be prisoners.

In reality the national defence in Asia Minor was no new organisation. It had existed for five centuries there he told Major Johnston as would be very frank with him, and, working clandestinely under the guise of promoting religion, churches and clubs for the Greek population, its end in view had always been ultimate mastery over the Turk. This end had been realised to a large extent when Greek troops occupied a zone in Asia Minor, but with the proposals of evacuation of the Greek army this organisation saw its hopes shattered. The result was a sudden effervescence caused by mixed feelings of fear and anger which revealed the secret organisation for the first time.

He could well understand these feelings, but taking everything into consideration he disapproved of the movement, for it was not a practical concern and consisted mainly of literature and rhetoric.

If the inhabitants of Asia Minor and the Greeks throughout the world wished to help Greece they could do three things:—

1. Volunteer for the army
2. Subscribe money for carrying on the campaign in Asia Minor
3. See that the families of soldiers at the front were looked after

The other day an individual, by the name of Lambros, had asked to see M. Sterghiadou, and during the conversation the man had stated that M. Venizelos was in favour of the movement. At this M. Sterghiadou became very enraged and menaced the man with a stick saying: "Do you think that if M. Venizelos wished me to know he was in favour of this movement he would inform so-and-so, who would tell me, Sterghiadou?"

Lambros, to tell me, Sterghiadou?"

He himself set up into such a rage telling Major Johnston that that was his opinion that he not only menaced the man, but beat him.

Actually M. Venizelos disapproved of the movement and had sent three telegrams expressing his views.

The first was to the effect that he disapproved of the movement.

The second said that if the movement ever became concrete its only hope of salvation was to get the High Commissioner to lead it, for only through him could the movement have the least chance of success.

The third stated that if M. Sterghiadou refused to lead this movement it must definitely be abandoned, for without him it could only end in calamity and ruin.

M. Sterghiadou went on to say that he had formed his opinion about the movement before he had heard what M. Venizelos thought of it. In the first place, nothing whatsoever should be done which might affect the moral of the army, and any separatist movement was bound to fail.

National Defence Committee talked of taxing the whole population in the occupied area and altering the impositions on the Public Debt funds, &c.

This was sheer folly. He himself had tried with the High Commissioners at Constantinople to obtain the legitimate super-tax paid by consumers on petrol and oil coming into the country. This tax, before the Greek occupation, went to the Constantinople Government, but since that time it had gone into the pockets of the oil companies. Over a year ago M. Sterghiadou had decided to use force in the matter. The immediate result was that Admiral Bristol arrived at Smyrna in his yacht and informed the High Commissioner that if he could use force so could the American Government, and M. Sterghiadou realised he was in a strait-jacket and struggled to get out.

Dismissed as the Great Powers and the neutrals were on all other questions, they
 Capitulations at Smyrna were affected.

Changing the subject, M. Sterghiadou did not think any conference would take place in the near future at the subject of the Capitulations at Smyrna were affected.

Now was the time for England and France, the two nations most concerned, to take the initiative. When he talked to people he was always considered as talking to a well-read man who had thought long on the subject.

Up to the sixteenth century the caliphate was run on Semitic lines and depended from a tribe. It was a purely religious power such as that of the Pope and had no secular authority.

This condition could be reverted to now, and in the next generation the Muslim world would take it for granted. He did not think there would be great trouble in India or Egypt if this happened.

Whenever England or France had used a firm hand in our Moslem countries (even in religious questions such as that of the Mahdi) the Moslem people had accepted our authority.

concerned, but throughout the Moslem world. In the Moslem world, the Oriental did not understand concessions, he understood force.

This was the reason why Germany would always have such a hold on Turkey. The Turk was naturally brutal. The German was not naturally brutal, but he studied brutality or hardness as a cold, calculating science, and this created in the Turkish mind a sense of affinity and consideration for the Germans.

Again, whether Germany and Russia combine in the next war or are enemies, Turkey will be on the German side. If there is a German-Russian war Turkey will remember her long-standing hatred for Russia and join Germany for the sake of self-protection. If the two countries are allied, Turkey will have to come in on their side to avoid future ill-treatment at the hands of Russia.

Moslem world, therefore, the more dangerous it was for Great Britain and France, for the influence of the religious head at Constantinople directed by a nation hostile to the British and French could do a vast amount of harm to their Moslem interests abroad.

Reverting to the National Defence Committee, M. Sterghiadou stated that there was no real direction to the movement, and it was a question of small-minded men leading small followings in various directions.

He then made a statement which struck Major Johnston as being of great importance.

He was a man who said what he thought and spoke openly. If he did not wish to give his opinion, he would not say it.

Nevertheless, he was no super-man who had the control of the evolution of all nations. Politics changed daily in all countries, and only at very infrequent periods did a nation's policy stabilise. His business was to adapt his policy to all these evolutions, and it was therefore impossible to say what he would think of the situation at any future point of time.

Major Johnston received when M. Sterghiadou was speaking was that he did not consider it quite impossible that one day he himself might be at the head of the movement.

Major Johnston then told the High Commission that he was going to Constantinople for a few days, and M. Sterghiadou repeated his remarks about the guarantees necessary before any evacuation could take place, and then, smiling, said: "And as these guarantees cannot be given, we will not evacuate."

As Major Johnston was leaving he explained the Turkish movement at Brusa as being a slight outbreak in a fresh part of the body of the cancer from which Turkey was suffering, and said he had given his orders on the matter to his local representative.

Mr. Landley to the Earl of Balfour — (Received June 12)

(No. 279)

Athens, June 1, 1922

I had some weeks ago a violent altercation with M. Lambros, of the National Defence Committee at Smyrna. This altercation had an interesting sequel, when M. Lambros applied recently to the Greek High Commissioner for a visa to visit Western Europe in the interests of the defence movement. I have no information as to whether the interview was accompanied by personal violence, but it ended in the High Commissioner's telling M. Lambros that, so far from receiving the desired visa, he would be deported forthwith to the Island of Naxos.

M. Lambros was accordingly placed on board ship, but unfortunately the direct sailing from Smyrna to Naxos, and his vessel put into Piræus, where M. Lambros disembarked and came up to Athens. The papers were full of this incident, and I asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs yesterday what the Government intended to do. M. Delaunay replied that M. Lambros was a worthless agitator, but, there being no martial law in Greece, the Government could not force him to proceed to Naxos. He would, therefore, have to be allowed to stay at Athens.

There is no doubt that the strong line taken by M. Sterghiadou, both towards the national defence movement and towards the Greek military authorities in Asia Minor, has made him many enemies in Greece. The papers have lately been full of abuse of the High Commissioner, who is denounced by some of the Venizelist press as a renegade, and by other journals as a traitor to the cause of Hellenism. In my opinion, almost the only man of strong character and high political integrity at present occupying an important post in Greece, and he is the greatest moral asset possessed by the Greek Government and the Crown.

The resignation of General Papoulas, Commander-in-chief in Asia Minor, reported in my telegram No. 262 of to-day's date, is a further sign of the struggle which M. Sterghiadou is carrying on. The General is known to have been sitting firmly on the fence regarding the defence movement in general and its relation to Venizelism in particular, and it is an open secret that the Greek civil and military authorities in Asia Minor have been hotly engaged in the struggle, which seems inevitable in the

struggle was particularly severe, though it ended with the complete victory of the civil power. It is to be hoped, in the general interest, that the retirement of General Papoulas is a stage in a similar victory for M. Sterghiadou.

Another reason put forward for General Papoulas's retirement is that he addressed a particularly warm telegram to M. Stratos during that gentleman's one day's absence from office. It is asserted, I believe with some truth, that this telegram caused great offence in Government circles, and that the predominant party determined to show that they were still masters of the situation, even though M. Stratos had joined the Government.

Other signs are not wanting to show that the newly formed Cabinet is already in difficulties. One Minister has, indeed, already resigned: M. Argyros, the Minister of Agriculture, having declared his disapproval of the agrarian policy of the Government. A much more serious divergence of views regarding the Crown threatens to break up the Government altogether. The press organs of M. Stratos have for several days been laying stress on the necessity of tackling the question of the recognition of King Constantine. The recalcitrant Powers should be asked plainly what their instructions were in this matter, and the Greek Government would then be able to choose their line of action. The implication would appear to be that, if the Powers announce that they will not recognise King Constantine, the Greek Government should ask the King to abdicate. I know that the Minister for Foreign Affairs disapproves of raising the question of recognition at all, and his views are shared by the other Government Ministers. If M. Stratos continues to press the matter, a Cabinet crisis appears inevitable, and this time the whole country may be involved.

It is hoped that the above description will have given some idea of the political atmosphere at present prevailing. It is in this atmosphere that the deadlock concerning the Paris peace proposals is forcing the Greeks to consider how they can solve the "national question" themselves. Both the country and the Government are, I believe,

gradually becoming convinced that the present position cannot be allowed to drag on much longer, and that there is little prospect of the Powers exerting any great influence on the issue. This is the tone of the press, the more extreme organs of which are again talking of finishing the war by the occupation of Constantinople. I have no reason to suppose that any such folly is contemplated by the Government, who are simply at their wits' ends between the necessity of putting an end to military expenditure and the political impossibility of leaving the Greek population of Asia Minor to their fate. In connection with the latter subject, I have the honour to report that the Minister for Foreign Affairs made an important statement in the Chamber last night. After referring to the fixed intention of the Kemalists to finish, once and for all, with the Christian minorities, and after eulogising the words of the Pope on this subject at the Eucharistic Congress, M. Balthazet asked whether, in face of what had

Power which, like Greece, had taken part in the great war, was morally bound not to abandon the Christians of the East to the knife of Kemal. The proposed enquiry into the Kemalist outrages offered the hope that the Powers would recognise their obligation and put an end to a state of affairs which dishonoured the civilised world. As a result of Kemal's calumnies, a similar commission had been proposed for the territory occupied by the Greeks in Asia Minor. The Greek Government were ready to open wide the doors to such a commission, knowing that it would find nothing to the discredit of the Greek Administration.

I have, &c
F. O. LINDLEY

E 5899 10 44]

No. 144

Sir H. Humboldt to the Earl of Balfour. - (Received June 12)

(No. 498)

His Majesty's representative at Constantinople presents his compliments to His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and has the honour to transmit herewith copy of a memorandum of conversation between Mr Knox and certain members of the Near East Relief on the 31st May, 1922.

Constantinople, June 2, 1922

Enclosure in No. 144

Memorandum

Dr. KENNEDY called this morning with Mr. Hawes, Miss Phelps and Miss Wood, all of the Near East Relief, who had just returned from Anatolia, the two former from Sivas and the last (referred to in our telegram No. 262) from Malatya, travelling via Samoun.

They fully confirm Major Yowell's and Dr. Ward's reports, and all are of the opinion that the situation in Anatolia is very serious. They kept no records of the numbers of deportees, but affirm that a conservative estimate places those passing Sivas at a minimum of 70,000, a large proportion of these being women and children. They were clothed in verminous rags and ravaged by small pox, typhus and dysentery. Both ladies had contracted typhus while working on the roads without shelter. Dr. Kennedy said that he had seen many who receive a loaf of bread daily. Miss Phelps showed me a specimen of this bread which apparently consists of straw and dirt.

Conditions both at Sivas and Malatya were somewhat better in the spring than in the autumn. The deportees were in a state of utter exhaustion. They learned next day from an American relief worker, who overtook them, that twelve out of their 200 had fallen dead on the 10 miles of road into Sivas. On their way towards the coast they passed bodies, numbers of fresh graves and some women and children who had struggled behind the convoys dying by the roadside.

All the Greek villages in the tobacco area around Samoun are abandoned. In Sivas, the great majority of women and children still remain.

Every night men of the Greek bands who have fled to the hills and are starving there attempt to enter the town in search of food. They are always fired on by the garrison, and often prolonged fights take place in the outskirts of the town.

Miss Phelps, who was in Anatolia during the war and saw something of the situation, and that they have a more apparent military object. The result, however, is the same, if not worse, in that the exiles are driven on until they die. It is believed that only a small number of the exiles are actually massacred. It is believed that only a small number of the exiles are actually massacred. It is believed that only a small number of the exiles are actually massacred.

All three of these relief workers struck me as impartial. They had been in the country for some time, and had seen much of the situation. Miss Phelps, who was in Anatolia during the war and saw something of the situation, and that they have a more apparent military object. The result, however, is the same, if not worse, in that the exiles are driven on until they die. It is believed that only a small number of the exiles are actually massacred. It is believed that only a small number of the exiles are actually massacred. It is believed that only a small number of the exiles are actually massacred.

I took an opportunity to ask their opinion as to the situation. They all agreed that they themselves, who had lived long in the country with unusual opportunities of ascertaining what was happening, had not learned half the truth. Beyond the difficulties of obtaining residence without assured protection, they thought that, long warning that would be necessary, the Turks would have ample time to cover up their tracks, and that a commission would find little concrete evidence.

Miss Wood, who confirms her statements to Dr. Gibbons (reported in our telegram No. 262) in regard to the Near East Relief, said that she had seen many of the same name. Miss Phelps and Mr. Hawes, both of whom expect to return to Anatolia, would not wish their names mentioned unless considered absolutely necessary.

May 31, 1922

E 5906 5 44]

No. 145

Sir H. Humboldt to the Earl of Balfour. - (Received June 12)

(No. 511 Confidential.)

My Lord,

THE French High Commissioner recently called on me and said that he had been to the customs regime which was to prevail between the two territories in question. Should the Kemalists wish to breach other subjects, Colonel Mouton would refer for instructions. General Pelle added that it would be useful for the French to receive first-hand reports of what was going on at Angora.

3. It was apparent to me in the course of the interview that General Pelle was not at all favourable to Colonel Mongin's mission, as he felt that it would be difficult for that officer to serve two masters in the shape of General Gouraud and General Pelle himself, whilst he probably rather dislikes the participation of General Gouraud, whether involuntarily or not, in matters which he, General Pelle, considers as coming within his own sphere of action.

HORACE RIMBOLD,
High Commissioner

E 5907 5 44

No. 146

Sir H. Rimbald to the Earl of Balfour.—(Received June 12.)
No. 512.)
My Lord,

I HAVE the honour, with reference to my despatch No. 406 of the 2nd instant, to transmit to your Lordship herewith a brief account of a meeting of the Allied Mixed Committee which was held on the 27th ultimo under the presidency of General Franks to study the various refugee problems which may arise in the event of the evacuation of Asia Minor by the Greek forces.

I have, &c.
HORACE RIMBOLD
High Commissioner

Enclosure in No. 146

Account of Meeting of an Allied Mixed Committee on Refugee Problems.

THE refugee problem in Asia Minor can be divided in three main considerations—

- (a.) Numbers of the population liable to take part in the exodus.
- (b.) Measures which might be taken to prevent an exodus.
- (c.) Measures to be taken if an exodus cannot be prevented.

An Allied Mixed Committee formed to study these questions met on the 27th ultimo under the presidency of Major-General Franks, on behalf of British headquarters, and attended by Colonel Roche and Colonel R. Letto as French and Italian military representatives, and by the Comte de Chambrun, Marquis de Sornog and Mr. Henderson as delegates of the three High Commissioners.

As regards (a) the figures compiled at the British and French headquarters of the total Christian population of the Greek occupied area differed somewhat the French figures giving 580,000, the British about 650,000, distributed approximately as follows—

Smyrna	350,000
Trametes	100,000
...	100,000
...

For the purposes of calculation therefore it was agreed that, in the event of a universal exodus, some 600,000 persons might participate in it. The figure is, of course, an extreme one, and was accepted by the committee as such.

As regards (b), the measures which might be taken to prevent an exodus en masse, the committee adopted the following resolutions:—

- (i.) That the Turkish army as an army should not be permitted to enter the evacuated regions.
- (ii.) That the nucleus of the gendarmes under Allied officers should be sufficiently organised before the departure of the Greek army.
- (iii.) That the League of Nations should be invited to assist in devising a definite scheme for the protection of minorities, and to despatch its commissioners to the spot before the evacuation commenced.
- (iv.) That nothing should be done to encourage the population to look for the assistance of the Allies in facilitating their flight.

In connection with this latter point, it was observed that though a certain number of persons and not private property (live-stock, household goods, &c.) would be evacuated.

To these resolutions may be added a reciprocal declaration by both belligerents of a general amnesty, as suggested in Sir H. Rimbald's despatch No. 406.

The committee was unable to make any suggestions except of the most general character as regards question (c), viz., the measures to be taken in the event of an evacuation, partial or general, taking place. The points considered in this respect were—

1. The selection of areas of concentration.

The neighbourhoods of Smyrna, Panderma and Moudania were regarded by the committee as most suitable for the concentration of refugees from the point of view of facilities not only for embarkation but also for protection since Allied warships could lie off those harbours.

2. Accommodation and supply in those areas.

This question, as well as that of the responsibility for the expenses which might be incurred in the various measures adopted, was reserved for discussion until further details should be forthcoming.

3. Protection of these concentration camps.

In principle it was agreed that the Allied forces, naval and military, should be employed for this purpose.

4. Destination of persons evacuated.

It was agreed that the Greek authorities should be requested to encourage the Greek authorities themselves to discourage any exaggerated form of exodus.

5. By what means the evacuation should be effected.

It was agreed that not less than one ship would be required for the evacuation of each 1,000 refugees. The example was quoted of the Russian evacuation from the Crimea when 142 vessels were employed to bring about 140,000 refugees to Constantinople under conditions of very great hardship.

E 5874 5 44,

No. 147

Lord Hardinge to the Earl of Balfour.—(Received June 12.)
(No. 1385.)

HIS Majesty's Ambassador at Paris presents his compliments to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and has the honour to transmit herewith copy of a note to M. Poincaré, dated the 10th June, 1922, respecting the attitude of His Majesty's Government to the proposal contained in the Angora note.

Paris, June 10, 1922

Enclosure in No. 147

Lord Hardinge to M. Poincaré.

M. le Ministre des Affaires Étrangères,
Paris.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute considération.

The Government are further elaborated, and in which the hope is expressed that the French Government will be able to bring about a settlement of the refugee problem in Asia Minor to the three Governments of Greece, Constantinople and Angora on the lines...

I have, &c.
HARDINGE OF PENSHURST

Lieutenant-Colonel Rawlinson to Mr. Oliphant. — (Received June 14.)

Dear Mr. Oliphant, Willesden Paddocks, Cricketerswood, June 11, 1922
 IN view of the fact that I have had a general review of the present situation at Constantinople, which is deduced from my own previous experience of the chief personalities and interests in those parts, checked this last week by conversations with the prominent men of all nationalities, including Nationalists.

I send it, please, with great deference, in case it may be of interest or possibly serve as confirmation or otherwise of other information.

Yours sincerely,
 A RAWLINSON

Enclosure in No. 148

Note on the Situation at Constantinople, June 8, 1922

THE following estimate of the actual position at Constantinople and its future possibilities is formed from considerable personal experience of the principal personalities, and from a study of the various reports and documents available.

1. The Nationalist Government at Angora have no intention of moderating their terms, for the following reasons:—

(a.) They consider that their policy, up to the present, has met with considerable success.

(b.) Though many of them feel the stress of continued mobilisation and war, they do not think it prudent to consider the whole of the country as a single unit, and the presence of the enemy in the field consolidates and strengthens the Nationalist Party and the military power throughout Anatolia, and that peace and evacuation might bring serious internal troubles and dissensions of which they are much in dread at the present time.

(c.) They have no fear of the success of any Greek offensive in the west—and in any case, if it were successful, the Greek population there, whom they have deported or are otherwise destroying.

(d.) They have the strongest conviction that whereas their propaganda campaign in India, Egypt, Iraq, &c., and their separate dealings with the various Allies have and are causing serious trouble, yet they themselves are in no way suffering in the same manner, and that the greater will be the advantages they may expect in the end to secure.

(e.) At any rate in the east, receiving substantial subsidies in Russian gold—the Eastern army of Kiazim Karabekir is entirely paid in Russian gold—this fact from my own personal observation at Erzerum up to November 1921.

2. On the subject of the Allied commission proposed to be sent into the Pontine districts (Trebisond or Samouni):—

(a.) It is hardly to be expected that Angora will accept any such commission, and

(b.) Its acceptance could only be expected in event of the Angora Government being satisfied that they would reap advantages therefrom.

(c.) It is probable that the Nationalists would have been prepared, and that evidence satisfactory to them would be forthcoming, which it would be impossible for such a commission to refuse although it might be known to be fabricated.

Such evidence would then be available not only in refutation of the present reports, but also in all the future similar cases which are certain to recur.

(d.) The barbarous treatment of the Pontine Greeks, Rhums, in the eastern vilayets have yet

come to light, and it is probable that definite and reliable details of them (in amplification of, and subsequent to, my own observations) will never be forthcoming, for obvious reasons.

(e.) The only really definite fact which could be at once substantiated, by the reliable evidence of those lately familiar with the country and its inhabitants, is

that the country twelve and eighteen months

ago was a very different place from what it is at present.

Thus, be it remembered, is not only a fact, but a fact of great importance.

and as often as the opportunity offers, it should be remembered.

3. Possible Solutions.—(a.) It is accepted on all hands that any employment of such force, either by the Allies jointly or otherwise, as would be adequate to ensure the safety of minorities is not to be at present expected.

(b.) The alternative of convincing the Angora Government that their true interests lie in conforming with the customs and prejudices of civilised communities may and doubtless will, eventually prevail, and a measure of control be obtained by this means, i.e., by the affording or withholding the technical and financial assistance for developments in Anatolia which the Angora Government now greatly desire to obtain and which will become more and more indispensable.

This eventual solution, which, in view of the undeveloped mineral wealth alone is a very real and practical one, is, however, probably premature at present.

upon the acceptance throughout the country of the Sultan's Government and a return to the status quo ante this might result in the break up of the Angora power.

This experiment, however, to have any real chance of success would call for a considerable propaganda campaign in Anatolia itself, by which much time would be lost, and any such idea is even then in all probability doomed to failure.

(d.) All circumstances seem to point to the probable early evacuation of Constantinople as the next development to be expected, and that such is sure to be the eventual policy of the British Government, and would of necessity be followed by or be simultaneous with evacuation by the French and Italians.

In such event the situation will undergo very radical modification.

(e.) It is on all hands assumed that no evacuation of Constantinople would be completed by the Allies which did not provide for the retention of the Gallipoli

(f.) The unanswerable argument to be advanced being the sanctity of the graves there, which sentiment would appeal to both Christian and Moslem.

4. The salient points of the position on the evacuation of Constantinople by the Allies and the retention of the Gallipoli peninsula are:

(a.) Any such evacuation would now be immediately followed step by step by a Greek occupation, which would be wholeheartedly supported by the wealthy class of the population, and by all those desirous of "law, order and prosperity" in Constantinople itself.

(b.) It is assumed that such a policy would be opposed by the French, who, in view of the fact that the Gallipoli peninsula is a French possession, would be naturally opposed to such a policy.

(c.) The Greek community in Constantinople and throughout Greece generally would welcome such a solution and would strain every nerve to seize such an advantage. It is it would appear they are now in a position to do, and might expect at any rate for some time to come.

(d.) The Turks generally, and especially the Angora Government, would be opposed to such an evacuation, though they would be bound to accept it if it were the only adequate ground for such opposition.

5. From the point of view of British interests only, the following results would appear to be wholly favourable:—

(a.) The difference between the occupation of vital portions of the Gallipoli Peninsula and the present occupation of Constantinople would effect a considerable saving of expense.

(b.) The effect of the evacuation throughout all islands would be entirely favourable to British interests, and the Turk would thus be deprived of the most effective weapon in his arsenal.

(c.) The control of the waterway to the Black Sea would be equally well assured at Gallipoli as at Constantinople, and the sea communication would even be simplified.

(d.) The town of Constantinople at all times lies at the mercy of any maritime Power occupying the Dardanelles.

(e.) The suggestion of such an evacuation might not be without its effect in other fields.

(f.) Though it may be assumed that the other Allies (notably the French) would also occupy portions of the peninsula—yet in event of future complications the decisive factor in the exercising of the control of the Dardanelles in future must always be the control of the sea outside, and the occupation would be permanent.

the permanent advantage which would be so gained for the Empire

A. RAWLINSON

June 11, 1922.

E 5992 27 44

N. 143

Director of Military Operations to Foreign Office. (Received June 14)

the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and begs to forward for his information the views of Major-General Sir William Thwaites, who is the British representative at Smyrna.

Major-General Sir William Thwaites would particularly draw the attention of Sir Eyre Crowe to the latter half of the report headed "Situation in Greek Occupied Areas (Thrace)," giving the views of General Pallas, the Chief of the Staff of the Greek army in Anatolia. The opinions therein expressed seem to be of particular significance.

War Office, June 13, 1922.

Enclosure 1 in No. 149

Report on Situation in Greek Occupied Areas (Anatolia).

(Views of General Pallas.)

(Secret.)

ACCORDING to General Pallas's personal opinion on the subject, that part of Asia Minor which is now occupied by the Greek troops will at some future date have imposed upon it one of the three following conditions:

A total evacuation by Greek troops and the complete reoccupation of the area that the whole of the Christian and anti-Kemalist population of the area will have been evacuated with the Greek army.

given to Greece. Here the army will stop, and not only guard the frontier on a war footing, but will also maintain security and order in the allotted zone.

(c.) An evacuation of the Greek army from Asia Minor, but no reoccupation by Turkish troops of a certain given zone. This zone might be—

(i.) The Smyrna enclave; roughly, the Sevres Treaty zone.

(ii.) An area west of and including Bursa and Usak.

(iii) and (iv) will exclude the Dardanelles zone, but will adjoin it.

2. In his opinion, the most likely condition is as given at (c). The zone will be an autonomous State, nominally under the Sultan, but governing itself under the supervision of the League of Nations, who will appoint the Governor and make arrangements for its good administration. In this solution it is taken for granted that Mustapha Kemal is prepared to play the game (a doubtful promise), but without assuming that some real mutual agreement has been come to it is useless discussing a peaceful administration; otherwise the autonomous State will always be threatened by war.

3. In this administration the essential factor will be a gendarmerie.

4. At the present time, under the Greek occupation, there exist between 3,000 and 1,000 gendarmes directly under the Greek High Commissioner, and under the Military Governor of Smyrna about 1,500 men, who are called gendarmes, but who in reality troops having had no special training in gendarmerie work before they arrive recruits in Asia Minor in order to free the 1st L. of C. regiment for the front. These men cannot be compared to the civil gendarmerie, who are greatly superior in training and experience.

5. The most important consideration in the formation of the gendarmerie is to insist on the very first moment of its organisation that it is a gendarmerie for the autonomous "Mikrasian" State. There will therefore be no difference made between Muslims and Christians in the gendarmerie. The main obstacle to achieving this will be the lack in some cases of a common language, but this can to a large extent be surmounted by the intermixing of the Muslims and Christians during their training while the Greek army is evacuating.

We have this difficulty in some of our Welsh regiments and also in Indian battalions, and the Greeks too in Macedonia recruited Bulgarians, Greeks and found that the difficulty could be overcome.

6. In General Pallas's opinion M. Storgiades's gendarmerie in very good the officers and men have much experience and have gained the confidence of the Muslim and the Christian population. Moreover originally this gendarmerie was specially chosen by M. Storgiades and in the last three years has had any unsuitable officer or man replaced. In forming a gendarmerie for the autonomous zone, therefore, General Pallas thinks that this gendarmerie should be used as a nucleus.

The strength of the gendarmerie to be aimed at for the three zones at paragraph 1

(i.) (ii) 12,000, and
(iii) 20,000 respectively

7. We have therefore a nucleus of about 4,000 Greek gendarmes from Greece, Crete and the islands. To obtain the rest there are the following sources which can be tapped:

(a.) Muslims (Turks).

(i.) Who were gendarmes under the Turkish rule.
(ii) In the area who have had military training.

(b.) Asia Minor Christians, of which there are 20,000 in the Greek army at the present time. At least 5,000 of these can be made into good gendarmes.

(c.) Muslims (non-Turks).

Yuraks. These are probably the best of the non-Turkish Muslims, being in reality a mixed race of shepherds who have now settled down in villages. They are not very intelligent, but honest and law-abiding.

Armenians. Intelligent, but passionate, with strong supervision however, they would make good gendarmes.

Other and smaller sections of the Muslim population might give a small number of recruits for gendarmerie.

(d.) Armenians. There are not a large number of these and General Pallas thinks their mountain instincts might lead to trouble.

In any case men should be chosen from the villages and not from towns where they are of inferior physique and in reality.

8. As the population of the zone allotted to the autonomous State will be divided approximately into one half Christians and one half Muslims, the proportion to aim at for each religion in the gendarmerie will also be 50 per cent.

(c) For officers, eight months to one and a half years, according to their experience.

Muslims and Christians work together in this country and in the towns and can live on friendly terms, but they must both be given security. In fact, once the menace of a victorious Khatul entering this area and taking reprisals on everyone who has obeyed the law of the governing administration is at an end, this scheme will not only be quite feasible, but will give the best results.

Secondly, if and when revived, she would be useful to France (which M. Sterghiades ventured to consider more doubtful still).

3 年

Constantinople had asked him to convey his salutations to M. Sterghiades, and that he was absolutely in agreement with him on the subject of the national defence movement. M. Sterghiades said he was pleased and that no thinking man could have any other opinion.

As time went on all this civil militia would disappear. For the moment he was allowing it to continue, as it gave the inhabitants of Asia Minor an outlet for their patriotic feelings and also a sense of security that something was being done for them. The only way of helping was for the civilian population of Asia Minor to join the army, not to form *us-ha* militias.

M. Sterghiades then had to go and return the French admiral's call.

Enclosure 3 to No. 149

Report on Situation in Greek Occupied Areas (Thrace).

Views of General Pallis.

With regard to the question of the Greek troops guarding the Thracian-Turkish frontier, General Pallis, who had gone back 5,000 yards, the Greek Chief of Staff informed me that the forces in Thrace depend from Athens, and that therefore it would be better for H. Q., A. F. C., to arrange the matter through the British military attaché at Athens directly with the Athens General Staff.

General Pallis stated that he was not even aware that this withdrawal on both sides had been asked for.

2. From this the conversation turned to the Greco-Turkish-Bulgarian frontier as proposed by the last Paris Conference. General Pallis maintained that, from a purely military point of view, the guarding of the Greek frontier would be very difficult, and, in the event of war by Greece against Bulgaria allied to Turkey, it would be impossible to retain the Adrianople-Gallipoli zone.

As far as he knew, Greece was to be prevented from keeping troops in the Eastern Thracian area except to guard the Bulgarian frontier north-west of Adrianople. West again of this part of the frontier the line followed the Tekeljik Dag and Katal Dag, at the latter of which a Bulgarian force descending from the north could isolate any Greek forces east of that point.

Again, the Greek line was of very great extent and would need more troops than Greece had available to guard it efficiently. The fact that its flanks were on mountain ranges was of small advantage in comparison to the disadvantage of its length.

Were the line to be the Chatalja line, this could be held by a small Greek force. The Greeks could hold the Turks at Chatalja, defeat the Bulgarians and then come back to fight the Turks; and during any such campaign the Dardanelles would be open so far as holding the European shore alone could keep them open.

With the present proposals, however, Greece could not be sure of holding on to the Dardanelles, because, as mentioned above, it would be necessary to move all her troops from Eastern Thrace to prevent them from being pinched in from the east, north and west.

He said he thought it was Marshal Foch who had proposed the line of the eastern frontier and asked me if I knew, so I informed him that the present frontier was a compromise between a line further west advocated by the British and one further west advocated by other Allies.

General Pallis then said that, with small Powers like the Balkan States, it was

Somewhere a cow would stroll across the boundary-line, a patrol on the other side would shoot it; this would bring about an exchange of shots between opposing patrols, and a few incidents such as this could easily inflame the two nations into going to war.

He said that at Eskishehr last summer after the first big advance—that so long as British troops (or even Allied troops under British command) remained at Constantinople, Greece would be content.

The general situation now, however, was very different to what it had been at that time, and the Greek General Staff (and he thought the Greek Government was of

the same opinion) considered that there were only two ways left of bringing about a decision on the Near East question:—

- (a.) By enforcing a blockade by the Greek navy.
- (b.) By taking Constantinople from the European side.

As regards (a), this was not yet permitted by the Allies—in fact, so much so that the Greeks were not even allowed to make use of their navy to search ships, although this was a recognised war measure. (I cite the example of the French and Italian ships which admittedly were carrying war material for the use of Kemal's army, but the retention of which cost the Greek Government 32,000,000 drachmas.)

This method, however, would take a long time to bring about a decision.

The taking of Constantinople, on the other hand, would bring about an instant change in the situation, and the Chief of Staff considered that there was little doubt that Constantinople could be taken.

Of the two divisions in Thrace, probably only one and a half would be necessary for the task. Even if Mustafa Kemal himself were not affected by the fall of Constantinople, the Moslems would in general would be greatly impressed by the fact, and the Turkish nation would assuredly impose its will on Mustafa Kemal to come to some reasonable terms with Greece.

Thus, however, was not the most important point in connection with the taking of Constantinople. The effect on Greece and all Greeks throughout the world would be absolutely electrical. Moral, patriotism and self-sacrifice would show themselves as never before, and the Allies could count on Greece performing unheard-of tasks.

(Colonel Sarryanis, too, in a conversation I had with him, said that, under the present conditions, there was no reason why the situation should not go on for ever, and, in his opinion, there was only one way of ending it, which was to take Constantinople and the Island Peninsula and hold a line across the latter, evacuate all Christians from Asia Minor to Thrace, Greece and the islands, evacuate the army, fighting a rear-guard action and destroying the country; and then say to the Greek people: "We know you have had great sufferings to undergo and sacrifices to make. We have deceived you over Asia Minor, but it was beyond our powers to remain there. The Greek nation is, however, once more in possession of 'The City'; and the answer of the Greek people would be: 'To have retaken the city is worth all the sacrifices we have made and will be called upon to make in the future.'")

Thus Constantinople has assumed additional importance for the Allies, and it is certain that Allied troops would evacuate it in the near future, and, with the Turkish alliance with Russia and Germany, it was difficult to say who would be in possession of the Bosphorus in a few years to come.

B 8128 19 44]

No. 150

Sir A. Geddes to the Earl of Balfour.—(Received June 19)

EX-100
Sr

Washington, June 9, 1922

I HAVE the honour to transmit to you, herewith, a copy of the reply of Mr. Hughes to the proposal to institute a joint committee of investigation into the reports for the renewal of the deportation of Christians by the Turkish authorities at Angora and the alleged atrocities connected therewith.

I have, &c.

(For the Ambassador),

R. L. CRAIGIE.

Enclosure in No. 150.

Mr. Hughes to Sir A. Geddes.

Excellency,

Department of State, Washington

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's letter of 15th May last, referring to reports of the renewal of the deportation of Christians by the Turkish authorities at Angora, and the alleged atrocities connected therewith, and

[8975]

2 n 2

communicating the proposal of His Britannic Majesty's Government that the British officers to proceed to such places in Anatolia as might best enable them to conduct an appropriate investigation.

In your Excellency's subsequent memorandum of the 19th May Turkish deportations and outrages might lead to retaliatory action in territory held by the Greek forces, and suggest that this Government should join in requesting the authorities functioning in Greece to permit the despatch of officers to regions under Greek occupation.

The situation of the Christian minorities in Turkey has enlisted to a marked degree the sympathies of the American people, and it has been noted with deep concern that the work of benevolent and educational institutions in Turkey has steadily been hampered, that the rights which American citizens have long enjoyed in Turkey in common with the nationals of other Powers have often been disregarded and the property rights and interests of Americans and other foreigners placed in jeopardy.

In view of the humanitarian considerations which are involved and of the desire of this Government to have adequate information through a thorough and impartial investigation of the actual conditions prevailing in Anatolia, in order that this Government may determine its future policy in relation to the authorities concerned, the President is prepared to designate an officer or officers to take part in the proposed inquiry.

In taking this course I should make clear to your Excellency my understanding that the proposed action is limited in scope to an enquiry to obtain accurate data as to what is in Anatolia for the information of the Governments participating therein.

I should advise you that this Government assumes no further obligation and enters into no commitment.

This Government suggests that, in order to expedite the enquiry, officers should be designated by the respective Governments concurrently in Ankara and that these two reports be made in a comprehensive report.

As I have not been advised of the reply which the French Government may have made to the British proposal, I shall be glad to communicate with the American representatives in Constantinople and Athens regarding the designation of officers or the sending of such communications to the local Greek and Turkish authorities, as may be necessary to open the way for the proposed investigation.

Accept, &c
CHARLES E. HUGHES

[E 8140 48 44]

No. 151

Sir H. Rumbold to the Earl of Balfour — (Received June 10.)

(No. 521.)

M

Yonkany, June 10, 1922

No. 431 of the 2th ultimo, to

of the three Allied High Commissioners, and the Standard Oil Company's note of the 13th April to the Sublime Porte, in which, in the judgment of the Allied High Commissioners, is created by certain installations of the Standard Oil Company at Kouroucheane and Selimish, and accordingly invites the Turkish authorities to take at once the necessary steps to prevent the utilization of the installations in question, as well as any further construction work upon them.

In reply, I desire to point out to your Excellency that the Kouroucheane and Selimish installations are being erected in accordance with the plans which, in the judgment of the Allied High Commissioners, is created by certain installations of the Standard Oil Company at Kouroucheane and Selimish, and accordingly invites the Turkish authorities to take at once the necessary steps to prevent the utilization of the installations in question, as well as any further construction work upon them.

Generally speaking, the Allied High Commissioners, as the civilian authorities, are ultimately responsible for the proper administration of this city, and that they can, if it be considered expedient, modify local administrative regulations to the safety of the city and its preservation from the risk of fire is a responsibility of which they cannot divest themselves.

I note from the terms of the letter addressed to Mr. Post Wheeler and enclosed in your Lordship's despatch No. 530 of the 26th ultimo that this standpoint has been upheld by the Foreign Office in its correspondence with the United States Embassy in London on the subject of inflammable liquids. I am most grateful for the support thus

afforded me. At the same time there is, so far as I am aware, no exact precedent for the exact situation which exists at Constantinople to-day, and I should feel myself on surer ground if I could be informed of the considered views of your Lordship's legal advisers, in the light of international law, on this aspect of the position of the Allied High Commissioners. Admiral Bristol's reply constitutes a complete denial of this moral obligation, and I would regret to have to submit to it.

At the same time an awkward conflict might arise if the Allied High Commissioners were categorically to insist, with the logical effects which such insistence may involve, on the standpoint hitherto adopted by them and on the rigid adoption of the action which they have recommended to the Turkish Government in the matter of these two oil depots. It is in this connection not impossible that the Turkish authorities and their regulations openly avoided by the Standard Oil Company with the connivance or approval of the United States High Commissioner.

I fully recognize in the present instance the undesirability of arriving at such an impasse or in general of raising, where they can be avoided, controversial questions likely still further to complicate a situation which is admittedly so abnormal.

Having regard therefore to this consideration, Admiral Bristol's note has been referred to the Advisory Trade Committee, which is at present engaged in elaborating a new law for the storage of inflammable liquids in order that the question of these oil depots may be taken into account in framing the relevant articles of that law.

At the same time my French and Italian colleagues and I have expressed to Admiral Bristol our willingness to consent to the maintenance of the Kouroucheane and Selimish installations, provided that the arrangements thereto are modified in such manner as to conform with the technical provisions of the law above mentioned.

I have the honour to enclose a copy of the joint communication which we have addressed to Admiral Bristol in this sense.

I have, &c
ROBERT R. BRISTOL,
High Commissioner

Reference 1 in No. 151

Admiral Bristol to Sir H. Rumbold

Excellency,

Constantinople, May 23, 1922

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Allied High Commissioners' collective note of the 13th April, in which there is enclosed a copy of a note of the 13th April to the Sublime Porte, in which, in the judgment of the Allied High Commissioners, is created by certain installations of the Standard Oil Company at Kouroucheane and Selimish, and accordingly invites the Turkish authorities to take at once the necessary steps to prevent the utilization of the installations in question, as well as any further construction work upon them.

In reply, I desire to point out to your Excellency that the Kouroucheane and Selimish installations are being erected in accordance with the plans which, in the judgment of the Allied High Commissioners, is created by certain installations of the Standard Oil Company at Kouroucheane and Selimish, and accordingly invites the Turkish authorities to take at once the necessary steps to prevent the utilization of the installations in question, as well as any further construction work upon them.

I take, &c
MARK L. BRISTOL,
United States High Commissioner.

Enclosure 2 in No. 151

Allied High Commissioners to Admiral Bristol

LES Hauts-Commissaires de France, de Grande-Bretagne et d'Italie soussignés ont l'honneur d'ackuser réception de la lettre que son Excellence l'Amiral Bristol a bien voulu leur adresser, le 23 mai dernier, au sujet des réservoirs à pétrole construits par la Standard Oil Company à Kourotcheoumé et à Séliné.

Les soussignés, qui sous le régime de l'occupation militaire, se considèrent comme effectivement responsables de la sécurité à Constantinople, estiment qu'à ce titre il leur appartient de prendre des dispositions en vue de prévenir les incendies. Conséquemment, au cas où les lois et règlements de l'Etat ottoman sur la matière s'avèreraient insuffisants, ils seraient en droit de les compléter par telles mesures particulières ou générales qui leur apparaîtraient comme indispensables.

C'est dans cet esprit que les Hauts-Commissaires ont cru de leur devoir d'appeler l'attention de la Sublime Porte sur les mouvements—signalés du reste par les habitants de ces localités eux-mêmes—que présentent les tanks à pétrole construits par la Standard Oil Company à Kourotcheoumé et à Séliné et ont demandé au Comité consultatif du Commerce d'en tenir compte dans l'élaboration du nouveau projet de loi concernant l'emmagasinage des liquides inflammables. Cette étude, presque terminée mais tenant, a été faite avec le concours de Mr Shaw, membre américain du comité, et de Mr Agguman, ingénieur de la Standard Oil.

Les dispositions du texte adopté par la commission à l'unanimité (sauf une réserve du représentant des Etats-Unis, relative à un point autre que celui dont il s'agit ici), il résulte implicitement que les installations de la Standard Oil sont situées dans les emplacements où, normalement, il ne devrait exister aucune construction de ce genre. Ces installations pourront toutefois subsister, en vertu d'une mesure exceptionnelle, sous condition de recevoir les modifications reconnues nécessaires pour qu'elles satisfassent aux prescriptions techniques stipulées par la loi.

C'est cette solution que les soussignés, dans un esprit de conciliation, ont cru devoir accepter, étant bien entendu que la Standard Oil prendra toutes dispositions en vue de se conformer à la loi, avant que les réservoirs soient mis en service.

PELLE.
HORACE RUMBOLD
(A. S. N.)

E 6136 5 44]

No. 152

Lord Hardinge to the Earl of Balfour — (Received June 19.)

No. 1437]

My Lord

Paris, June 17, 1922

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship a copy of a note which I have received to-day from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, in reply to the memorandum which I was instructed to communicate to the French Government, giving the views of His Majesty's Government as to the meeting of a conference for the settlement of peace conditions between the Governments of Angora, Constantinople and Athens. I am happy to remark that this is the first communication which I have received for some time from the French Government couched in more diplomatic and friendly terms than those notes which I have received during the past few weeks.

When I saw the Secretary-General for Foreign Affairs this afternoon, I asked him what really were the views of the French Government as to the best manner of settling this question, with a view to ensuring peace between Turkey and Greece. M. Peretti at once replied that the whole question appeared to him to be one of form and substance. The first alternative proposed in Lord Curzon's memorandum took the

three Governments, while the second alternative meant failure and publication of failure to the world. The French Government believed the terms proposed by the conference in Paris to be just and equitable, and that there would in the end be no difficulty in imposing them upon the three Governments concerned. At the present moment no one of the three Governments is willing to accept the conditions. Each of them wished to discuss them. At the same time the French Government are

convinced that all three Governments are keenly desirous of peace. Colonel Motron, who has been in Angora, has reported to the French Foreign Office that at Angora they are keenly desirous of peace, and that although they may bluff they will not in the end be so intractable as might be imagined. The French Government has received similar reports from Athens and Constantinople. They are therefore of opinion that if a meeting of all three Governments, together with the representatives of the three Great Powers, is convened at Ismid, Constantinople or anywhere else, it would be practically certain that the conference would be crowned with success. The action that the French Government meditate is that the three Powers presenting an united front should dictate at the conference table the conditions of peace to the representatives of the three Governments, stating their conviction that they are both right and just, and that, while maintaining them as the basis of the treaty to be concluded, they are ready to discuss them and to explain their fairness and justice. If, after discussion, one of the three Governments concerned should refuse to accept the peace conditions, they would then be told by the representatives of the three Great Powers that they would be held responsible before Europe and the world for the continuation of the war, and M. Peretti expressed his conviction that no one of the three Governments involved would dare to undertake such a serious responsibility. In any case,

it appears to me that there is some force in the argument of the French Government, and that the mode of procedure that they suggest presents a better chance of success than the alternative proposed by Lord Curzon, since it presents an opportunity for persuasion and conviction through argument, which after all is the chief use of diplomacy.

I have, &c.

HARDINGE OF PENRHURST

Enclosure in No. 152

M. Poincaré to Lord Hardinge

Ministère des Affaires étrangères,

Paris, le 16 juin 1922.

M. l'Ambassadeur,

Je me faisant excuser par une lettre de ce que je n'ai pu personnellement vous adresser la communication du 15 mai, relative à la

Le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté exprime tout d'abord son sincère regret de ne pas avoir pu, jusqu'à présent, parvenir à un accord avec les Gouvernements d'Angora, d'Athènes et de Constantinople. Il regrette également que les négociations préparatoires, qui auraient lieu actuellement entre les Hauts-Commissaires alliés et les représentants des Gouvernements d'Angora, d'Athènes et de Constantinople, ne constituent pas une violation, dans leur lettre et dans leur esprit des droits réservés à la Conférence de Paris. Il marque le peu de confiance qu'il a dans l'issue favorable de ces négociations. Il estime que si les Grecs et les Turcs reprennent les négociations de paix qui leur sont faites, ce sont eux et non les Alliés qui porteront la responsabilité de la continuation de la lutte. Il indique que les Alliés ne trouvent en présence de l'alternative suivante :

Où envoyer une nouvelle communication aux Gouvernements d'Angora, d'Athènes et de Constantinople pour exiger dans un délai donné l'acceptation des conditions

Où procéder à la liquidation du plan arrêté à la Conférence de Paris et à la poursuite des négociations avec les Gouvernements alliés et les Gouvernements belligérants, d'autre part, entre les Gouvernements alliés eux-mêmes.

In conclusion, I beg to repeat, what, I think, you yourself once stated, that the Allies, acting through the Provisional Financial Commission of Control, have during the last eighteen months averted the total collapse of the Turkish Administration, which otherwise would have taken place long before now, and whatever the Turkish Government may say, it is a fact that if the crazy machine has been kept going at all it is due, in large part, to the efforts of the High Commissioners.

I beg to thank you for the support you have always given me.

I have, &c.
ADAM BLOCK

E 6168 557 44]

No. 154

our H. Rumbold to the Earl of Balfour — (Received June 20)

(No. 535.)

My Lord

I HAVE the pleasure to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th inst. in relation to the Turkish Treasury for the year 1915, and the letter of the 15th inst. showing the balance of the Provisional Financial Commission of Control. I have also received your letter of the 16th inst. regarding the Turkish Treasury for the year 1915, and the letter of the 17th inst. regarding the Turkish Treasury for the year 1915.

We have discussed the enclosed letter from the Provisional Financial Commission of Control at our weekly meeting on the 15th instant, and decided to approve the suggestions put forward by Sir Adam Block. The Provisional Financial Commission of Control is being informed accordingly.

I received this morning a visit from the Finance Minister, whom I had not yet met on an opportunity of meeting. He came to discuss the present situation of the Turkish Treasury, and the object of his visit was to enlist my support in obtaining advances sufficient to tide him over the next few months, so as to enable him during that period to prepare proposals which would be submitted to the Council of the Turkish Ministry of Finance. I had been prepared for some such démarche on the part of the Minister of Finance. My colleagues and I are well aware of the gravity of the Turkish Treasury and have already had a preliminary exchange of views as to the best way of meeting the crisis. We are unanimous in considering that the Turkish Government

must be enabled to continue its administration until such time as a more permanent system was organized. The Finance Minister's suggestions were now under consideration. He agreed that certain branches of the Turkish Administration were now necessary. He also proposed a reduction of salaries for two years on reduced pay. I said that other countries had been obliged to take the bull by the horns and make drastic reductions in the staffs of Government Departments. The Turkish Government should do likewise. The Minister of Finance then said that a discontent would be aroused if officials were got rid of in a wholesale fashion. I enquired what was the necessary saving. He replied that, although he had not completed the study of the

problem, he estimated a saving of £ T 300,000 a month. The Minister of Finance then developed his suggestions for the next few months. He pointed out that the value of the unsold stocks belonging to the Turkish Government, which had been put at two advances of £ T 800,000 and £ T 1,200,000 respectively, was put at £ T 400,000 by the Commission of the Debt. Although he thought this valuation too low, he suggested that the Turkish Government, in order to obtain an advance of £ T 1,200,000 made on the stocks, might, after taking into

account the value of the stocks remaining unsold, to make an advance of £ T 1,000,000. This suggestion forms the basis of the suggestion which I am forwarding to the Provisional Financial Commission of Control for their observation.

It is also deposited here and which, he contends, is the property of the Turkish Government. I shall refer this suggestion equally to the Provisional Financial Commission of Control.

6. Finally, the Minister of Finance suggested that the Council of the Debt should pay the coupons of the internal loan raised during the war.

7. My colleagues and I propose to discuss the financial situation thoroughly at our next meeting.

I have, &c.
HORACE RUMBOLD
High Commissioner

Enclosure in No. 154

Sir A. Block to Sir H. Rumbold

M. le Haut Commissaire

Je me fais un devoir de vous faire savoir que la situation du Trésor pour le mois de juin s'établit comme suit, d'après les prévisions de la Commission provisoire de Contrôle.

Recettes	£ T	£ T.
Douanes	1,050,000	
Vilayet	400,000	
Eastern Telegraph	40,000	
Divers	50,000	
		1,540,000
Dépenses		
Remboursement avances D P O.	350,000	
Anticipations à régler le 15 juin	1,000,000	
Frais	100,000	
Tratements totaux de juin		1,450,000

Déficit prévu pour fin juin 90,000

Ce dernier chiffre mérite d'autant plus de retenir l'attention que toutes les ressources du Trésor sont épuisées. Il est donc certain que le Ministère des Finances devra, pour éviter le déficit, recourir à la vente des stocks de marchandises appartenant au Trésor.

Dans ces conditions, la Commission provisoire de Contrôle estime que le seul moyen de surmonter la crise actuelle de revêtir un caractère plus aigu résiderait dans le retour à la situation normale jusqu'au mois de mars dernier, et consistant à régler les traitements le 1^{er} et le 15 de chaque mois et les autres appointements, les disponibilités permettant, sous les vingt jours.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Haut Commissaire, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Veuillez agréer, &c.
Le Président,
ADAM BLOCK

Sir H. Rumbold to the Earl of Balfour.—(Received June 20.)

(No. 536. Confidential.)

My Lord,
I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th inst. in relation to the subject of the oil question.

regard to the procedure as between Admiral Bristol and the Allied High Commissioners there is not quite correct. The correspondence between the Allied High Commissioners and Admiral Bristol has been, in the main, confined to questions relating to the

of oil. The notes on these two questions have not been

3. I very much doubt whether I could induce my colleagues to accept the suggestion that Admiral Bristol should be invited to attend the meetings of the High Commissioners at which questions relating to American interests were likely to come up. I do not think that his attendance at our meetings would conduce to the prompt despatch of business. On the other hand, I am in entire agreement with the expediency of interesting American representatives in conferences at which American interests may be discussed, and it was with this object

Committee. All questions affecting American interests are dealt with by this committee on which Admiral Bristol has a representative. This arrangement has, on the whole,

subjects discussed by the Allied High Commissioners. I do not think that questions

conference at which Admiral Bristol was present, and I consider that this question, which is the only big issue at present between the Allied High Commissioners and Admiral Bristol, is more properly dealt with by exchange of notes, which, however, do not preclude personal discussion. Indeed, this High Commission is in continuous touch with the American High Commission through the Counsellor of Embassy and the American First Secretary.

4. I recently had a conversation with Admiral Bristol with regard to the oil question, and we went over the whole ground together. I pointed out to him that, whatever might be their motives in adopting the standpoint which they had adopted, the Allied High Commissioners had not used their position here to further their national interests in this or any other matter. No Allied interests were at present concerned in the oil question, and the measures we had adopted were devised in the

with regard to the storage of inflammable liquids, which is practically ready, will soon be promulgated, and that this troublesome question will disappear. I think there is little doubt that Admiral Bristol's attitude in connection with the oil question has been largely influenced by the Standard Oil Company.

5. I would add that on two or three recent occasions Admiral Bristol has gone out of his way to show courtesy in helping this High Commission. I may mention that he was fired on by the forts at Odessa. Then, again, Admiral Bristol allowed Mr. Childs, who is charged with the duty of repatriating Russian refugees from Egypt, &c., to take a passage in an American destroyer to Alexandria. My personal relations with Admiral Bristol are excellent.

I have, &c.
HORACE RUMBOLD
High Commissioner

Sir H. Rumbold to the Earl of Balfour.—(Received June 20.)

N
M

Yenikoy, June 13, 1922

Affairs called on me yesterday to enquire as to the progress of the negotiations for a peace settlement in the Near East. He five weeks since the Turkish Government had sent the subject to the Allied High Commissioners. I referred Izzet Pasha to the answer given by Mr. Harcourt in the House of Commons on the 25th May in answer to the subject by General Townshend and Mr. Aubrey Herbert. I gave Izzet Pasha the substance of Mr. Harcourt's reply, showing that His Majesty's Government would prefer to obtain a definite acceptance or refusal of their offer from the three Governments concerned.

2. I pointed out that if the Near East settlement had been hung up the fault lay mainly at the door of the Angora Government. That Government had proposed a preliminary meeting at Istanbul from which the representatives of the Constantinople and Greek Governments had declined to take part. I pointed out that the Angora Government had commended itself to me, nor did I believe that His Majesty's Government was in favour of such a meeting. I suggested that Istanbul would be a suitable place for a meeting to which all the parties

3. Izzet Pasha told me that when he had been in Paris he had been told by the Kemal representatives why the Angora Government had been so hostile against the Greeks, saying that the Kemalists were always proclaiming that their army could and would drive the latter out of Asia Minor. He went on to say that the Kemalists had made a great mistake in not accepting a regular armistice which would have prevented incidents such as the recent bombardment of Samosun by a Greek squadron. As it was, a state of armistice practically existed on the front at the present moment.

4. We then discussed the attitude of the Angora Government towards the Committee of Union and Progress. Izzet Pasha said that the attacks made on himself by the Angora Government at the time he had gone to London and Paris had recalled very well, and recalled the attacks on him. These had had the effect of weakening Mustafa Kemal's position, and, in order to strengthen it, the latter was now endeavouring to get support from the adherents of the Committee of Union and Progress.

I have, &c.
HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner.

Sir H. Rumbold to the Earl of Balfour.—(Received June 20.)

(No. 555. Very Confidential.)

My Lord,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th inst. in relation to the subject of the oil question.

I have, &c.
R. GRAHAM

Text of Resolutions, etc., of Paris Near Eastern Conference of March 1922, as finally Agreed upon between French and British Governments

1. Programme d'Évacuation de l'Asie Mineure

Pour que l'évacuation de l'Asie Mineure par les troupes helléniques et sa réoccupation par l'armée turque puissent avoir lieu sans effusion de sang et sans dévastations, il est nécessaire que les armées helléniques et turques soient réciproquement garanties contre toute reprise des hostilités même partielle au cours de leurs mouvements, que les populations et leurs biens soient garantis contre toutes exactions ou représailles de la part de l'une ou de l'autre des armées, que les opérations soient préparées et réglées suivant un programme général établi à l'avance et dans tous ses détails, qu'un organe interallié soit chargé d'établir ce programme de concert avec les Hauts-Commandements hellénique et turc, puis d'en diriger et d'en contrôler l'exécution et qu'il soient investis à cet effet des pouvoirs nécessaires pour régler les incidents qui pourraient se produire à cette occasion.

(1) le plan d'évacuation des forces helléniques, réglée par zones successives en jonction des possibilités de l'administration civile du pays et des forces de sécurité locales, (2) le plan d'évacuation des forces turques, réglée par zones successives en jonction des possibilités de l'administration civile du pays et des forces de sécurité locales, (3) le plan de réoccupation des forces turques, limitant les effectifs destinés à l'occupation de chaque zone et conjugué avec le plan précédent de manière qu'une bande de terrain libre de troupes soit constamment interposée entre les deux armées pour éviter les contacts, (4) le plan d'embarquement des forces helléniques.

Pour diriger l'exécution de ce programme et en assurer le contrôle, l'organe interallié d'une mission alliée comprenant des officiers de contrôle, des hommes de troupes et des moyens de transport et de liaison (automobiles, télégraphie sans fil), (2) dans la zone à évacuer d'une mission alliée destinée, pendant la période envisagée, à participer à la réorganisation et à contrôler l'emploi des forces de sécurité locales, gendarmes et police, (3) dans les ports d'embarquement, de forces interalliées destinées à coopérer au maintien de l'ordre et à la police des embarquements (à Smyrne, trois bataillons environ, un de chaque Puissance, dans la région de Brussa, à Moudata et à Panderna, un bataillon et demi). Des forces navales alliées sous commandement interallié devront contribuer à la police des opérations à chaque point d'embarquement.

Les Gouvernements intéressés sont invités à reconnaître l'autorité, en matière de son siège à Smyrne et à prendre toutes mesures pour que les décisions de cet organe soient strictement exécutées par leurs troupes ou par les agents de leurs administrations civiles.

Les Alliés ne sauraient en aucun cas accepter la responsabilité du maintien de l'ordre lors de l'évacuation, non plus que le contrôle direct de l'administration civile dans chaque zone. Ce soin incombera aux autorités grecques jusqu'à évacuation, et aux autorités ottomanes dès le départ des troupes helléniques.

2. Minorités

Les trois grandes Puissances considèrent qu'elles ont le devoir d'assurer des garanties spéciales pour la protection des minorités chrétiennes dans les possessions turques. Une commission interalliée sera faite, par une commission interalliée nommée par les trois Ministres des Affaires étrangères, pour examiner les différents traités rédigés depuis l'armistice. Ces dispositions, après avoir été définitivement amendées et approuvées par les Puissances, seront incorporées dans les articles du futur Traité de Paix et seront applicables, *mutatis mutandis*, à toutes les minorités intéressées. La Société des Nations, dans laquelle il est présumé qu'après

¹ The British version contains five paragraphs showing that the "organe interallié" is the committee of Allied generals at Constantinople acting where necessary in concert with the committee of Allied admirals. The French Government has been asked for an assurance that it adheres to the substance of this.

la conclusion de la Paix la Turquie sera admise dans les mêmes conditions que la Grèce, à être invitée à assumer spécialement la responsabilité, d'une part, d'assurer ces garanties et d'autre part, d'en poursuivre l'exécution. La Société des Nations sera invitée à désigner, après consultation des Gouvernements de la Grèce et de la Turquie, des commissaires spéciaux chargés de surveiller l'exécution des clauses du nouveau traité relatives aux minorités, aussi bien en Europe qu'en Asie. L'attention de la Société des Nations sera spécialement attirée sur la nécessité de tels commissaires dans les zones suivantes: (1) Asie à Smyrne, dans le Pont dans les vilayets de l'est et du sud-est en Cilicie, et (2) Europe en Thrace et en Thessalie. Ces commissaires auront pour mission sous le contrôle général du Haut Commissaire du Conseil de la Société des Nations à Constantinople de faire des visites périodiques dans les zones en question et, de concert avec les autorités locales, de prendre les mesures nécessaires pour protéger les minorités conformément aux clauses du traité. Lesdits commissaires feront directement des rapports au conseil de la Société des Nations et les soumettront à la réunion annuelle de l'Assemblée de la Société pour permettre aux nations représentées à l'Assemblée d'être en mesure d'assurer la fidèle exécution des stipulations pour lesquelles la Société aura accordé sa garantie.

3. Arménie

Les trois Puissances, conscientes des engagements, qu'elles ont publiquement pris en tant d'occasions, d'assurer au peuple arménien une existence nationale autonome, et des vœux de mettre en harmonie l'exécution de ces engagements avec la situation de fait actuelle, ont décidé d'inviter la Société des Nations à assumer la responsabilité spéciale de l'exécution des garanties qui sont recommandées pour la protection des Arméniens. La conclusion de la paix sera admise comme mentire de cette Société. Les Puissances estiment qu'il ne pourra se présenter d'occasion plus favorable de donner satisfaction aux demandes des Arméniens, qui, aussi bien en nombre qu'en importance, sont au

premier rang des aspirations générales de se voir réserver un foyer national dans l'une ou l'autre des zones de l'Asie Mineure où il a jusqu'ici résidé en nombre considérable. Le choix de la région où ce foyer pourra le mieux être assuré dépend de conditions politiques, économiques et sociales sur lesquelles il est actuellement impossible de se prononcer définitivement. Toutefois, les Puissances recommanderont particulièrement à la Société des Nations d'entreprendre, aussitôt après la conclusion de la paix, en rapports avec le Gouvernement ottoman à l'effet de créer un tel foyer national pour les Arméniens, et de s'efforcer de déterminer les conditions auxquelles il peut être réalisé et pourvu des garanties nécessaires à son existence future. À cet effet, les trois Puissances promettent de donner toute l'assistance possible, convaincues que la solution amiable du problème arménien est également désirable dans l'intérêt des Arméniens, de la Turquie et de la paix de l'Orient.

4. Thrace

La frontière en Europe entre la Grèce et la Turquie suivra le tracé suivant: elle partira d'un point à choisir dans le voisinage de Giannou sur la mer de Marmara et sera tracée dans une direction nord et nord-est pour aboutir à la frontière bulgare, dans le massif occidental des monts Strandja, laissant en territoire grec les villes de Lüleburgaz, Tekirdag, et de Koyunlu. La zone comprise entre la frontière grecque et la frontière bulgare sera constituée, qui comprendra le territoire européen de la Turquie et, en territoire hellénique, l'espace compris entre la frontière gréco-turque définie par un point situé à 20 kilom. au sud d'Andrinople, un arc de cercle de même rayon ayant son centre à Andrinople, et le cours de cette rivière jusqu'à la frontière bulgare.

Le Gouvernement ottoman accordera au commerce de la partie de la Thrace comprise entre la frontière grecque et la frontière bulgare, les facilités, les routes et chemins de fer construits et à construire vers ce port.

En ce qui concerne les villes d'Andrinople et de Smyrne, il sera inséré dans le Traité de Paix des dispositions relatives à la répartition des populations. Ces dispositions s'inspireront notamment du projet de traité signé le 10 août 1920 entre la Grèce d'une part, et l'Empire britannique, la France, l'Italie et le Japon d'autre part.

3. Zone démilitarisée

Dans ceux des territoires de la zone démilitarisée qui sont ou seront occupés par les Alliés et qui sont définis ci-après, les forces de gendarmerie helléniques ou ottomanes seront subordonnées au commandement interallié d'occupation de ces

Cette zone démilitarisée comprend

1 En Europe

Limites de la mer Egée du cap Helles à l'embouchure de la Maritza rives orientales de la Maritza jusqu'à un point situé à 20 kilom. au sud d'Andrinople—arc de cercle ayant Andrinople comme centre, avec le même rayon jusqu'à sa rencontre avec la rivière Pravodja, cours de cette rivière jusqu'à la frontière bulgare—frontière bulgare jusqu'à la mer Noire—côtes de la mer Noire jusqu'au Bosphore (rive ouest)

2 En Asie

Bosphore (rive est)—côtes de la mer Noire jusqu'au cap situé à 18 kilom. est de Sbalé ligne allant de ce cap au cap de Yarindjé (golfe d'Ismid)—côtes de la mer de Marmara au cap de Yarindjé, à l'isthme séparant du continent la presque île d'Artik—ligne traversant cet isthme dans sa partie la plus étroite, côte de la Marmara jusqu'au point où la frontière du sandjak de Tebanak aboutit sur la Marmara, frontière du sandjak jusqu'à son débouché dans le golfe d'Adramiti

3 Iles

Sont comprises dans la zone démilitarisée

- (a) Les îles de la mer de Marmara
- (b) Les îles de Samothrace, Imbros, Tenedos, Lemnos et Mytilène

En vue d'éviter les contacts armés entre les forces turques et helléniques, et de garantir d'autre part la liberté des Détroits

1 Dans le délai de trois mois à partir de la mise en vigueur du futur traité il sera procédé au désarmement et au démantèlement de tous ouvrages, fortifications ou batteries dans une zone comprenant les territoires et îles définies ci-dessus

Il sera procédé également dans le même délai à l'enlèvement et à la destruction de tous organes de défense maritime (tubes lance-torpilles, lignes de torpilles, filets ou obstructions de toute nature, projecteurs, etc.) existants sur le littoral ou dans les eaux de la même zone

Sont interdites, dans ladite zone et dans ces îles, la reconstruction de ces ouvrages et la construction d'ouvrages semblables. La France, la Grande-Bretagne et l'Italie auront le droit, dans ladite zone, ainsi que dans les îles de Lemnos, Imbros, Samothrace et Tenedos, de préparer la mise hors de service des routes et voies ferrées existantes et pouvant être utilisées pour amener rapidement des batteries mobiles, et dont l'établissement y reste interdit

Dans les îles de Lemnos, Imbros, Samothrace et Tenedos, l'établissement de nouvelles routes ou voies ferrées ne pourra être entrepris qu'avec l'autorisation des trois Puissances ci-dessus mentionnées

2 Les mesures prévues au paragraphe 1, alinéa premier, seront exécutées, par les soins et aux frais de la Grèce et de la Turquie en ce qui concerne leurs territoires respectifs et sous le contrôle prévu à l'article

3 Les territoires ainsi que les eaux, ports et rades de la zone démilitarisée et les îles qu'elle comprend ne pourront être utilisés militairement en cas de nécessité que sous la disposition et sous le contrôle de l'emploi dans lesdites zones et îles des forces de

ordre, non plus que d'une garnison hellénique dans l'île de Mytilène, et d'une

Toutefois, les effectifs maximum autorisés pour ces forces de gendarmerie et de police et pour ces garnisons seront fixés en considération du service à assurer par le

4 La Grande-Bretagne, la France et l'Italie agissant conjointement auront la faculté d'exercer la surveillance sur toute l'étendue de la zone démilitarisée, de manière à empêcher qu'aucune action puisse être effectuée ou préparée qui directement ou indirectement, serait susceptible de porter atteinte aux stipulations des alinéas 1, 2 et 3 précédents

Cette surveillance sera exercée

Au point de vue naval, par un stationnaire de chacune desdites Puissances alliées

Au point de vue militaire, par un service d'inspection confié à des officiers alliés et qui sera organisé dans les conditions fixées par le commandement interallié d'occupation.

5 La Grande-Bretagne, la France et l'Italie, agissant conjointement, auront en Marmara, jusqu'à Rodosto inclus, telles forces militaires et aériennes qu'elles estimeront nécessaires

Tout en limitant l'occupation interalliée à la région ci-dessus visée, lesdites Puissances se réservent le droit de l'étendre conjointement à d'autres régions de la zone démilitarisée prévue, dans le cas où les stipulations qui font l'objet des présentes dispositions viendraient à être

6 Les forces d'occupation visées, ci-dessus, pourront en cas de nécessité exercer le règlement annexé à la Convention IV de La Haye 1907, ou toute autre convention qui viendrait à remplacer celle-ci et à laquelle chacune desdites Puissances serait partie Toutefois, ces réquisitions ne pourront être effectuées que moyennant paiement immédiat

7 La Grande-Bretagne, la France et l'Italie retireront leurs troupes de Constantinople et de la partie de la zone démilitarisée qu'elles doivent évacuer trois mois à partir de la mise en vigueur du traité

Une commission sera constituée dans les quinze jours qui suivront la mise en vigueur du traité de la zone démilitarisée prévue ci-dessus. Cette commission sera composée de trois membres respectivement nommés par les autorités militaires de la France, de la Grande-Bretagne et de l'Italie, et, selon les cas, d'un membre nommé par le Gouvernement hellénique, ou d'un membre nommé par le Gouvernement ottoman, en ce qui concerne la partie de la zone restant sous le contrôle des forces de la Turquie. La commission, qui statuera à la majorité des voix, seront obligatoires pour les parties intéressées

Les frais de cette commission seront imputés au compte des frais d'occupation de ladite zone

6 Forces armées de la Turquie

Quant aux forces armées de la Turquie, les Puissances ne voient pas la possibilité de leur imposer des restrictions qui seraient susceptibles de leur faire perdre leur caractère national

Les Puissances alliées recommanderont à la Turquie l'utilité de maintenir, pour l'organisation, le commandement et l'instruction de la gendarmerie, indiquant que ces officiers seraient au service de la Turquie selon les pratiques en usage avant 1914

Après un examen approfondi fait par les experts militaires des chiffres qu'il est

45.000 hommes pour la gendarmerie

40.000 hommes pour l'armée

85.000 hommes au total

7 Dispositions financières

Il n'est pas dans l'intention des trois Puissances de prévoir dans le Traité de Paix un contrôle général des finances et de l'administration ottomane. Le décret de Moharrém, les décrets annexes ainsi que tous les contrats énumérés à l'Annexe I des clauses financières du projet de Traité de Sèvres sont maintenus.

Le Traité de Saint Germain supprimant les fonctions des délégués allemand et austro-hongrois au Conseil de la Dette publique ottomane.

3 n 3

nople was exceedingly irritating to the Turks. I do not agree with this. In short, the Turks dislike us all, but, in my opinion, they dislike the British less than the others, as they consider that we are more just. In addition, we bring more money into the city and we support everything, and, what is more, we pay for everything.

8. I think the British force has done very well here, and I also think British prestige in and around Constantinople stands very high to-day. That, however, is not a military reason for retention.

9. It is, at the same time, a very important matter *vis-à-vis* both the Turks and the Allies. Our position here must not be lowered. It has been built up slowly and surely by the dignified demeanour and behaviour of the British naval and military forces and by the straightforward work of the civil and military officials. The position of the British High Commissioner as senior High Commissioner is a strong one, and, in a lesser degree, my position as Allied Commander-in-Chief commands a certain amount of respect.

10. At the same time, though it will be admitted that we have made enormous reductions and savings, yet we still form a serious item of expense, costing, according to a statement I saw in the House recently—220,000 £ a month. Although theoretically recoverable from Turkey it must be a matter of doubt whether this money ever will be recovered. Our organisation includes highly paid officers in proportion to the size of the force, which is much scattered. In addition to my position and the Allied staff there is the General Officer Commanding British Corps of Occupation and staff, and there are several senior officers employed on various duties.

They are employed on useful work, and work which will be of great value if an opportunity arises. I am sure that your consideration whether or not the Allied command and Inter Allied Mission of Control and Organisation, together with the sub-commissions of gendarmerie disarmament and special elements should not be abolished or suspended, and the British force reduced to one or two battalions just to show the flag and form an escort to the Embassy and protection to the Sultan. From a military point of view I recommend it as I know that the limited number of British troops we have here are required for guarding our own possessions. As I have frequently pointed out, this is a bad station for troops separated, as they are, from their families. It might be advantageous to station the small force mentioned above at Gallipoli and leave only the minimum force in Constantinople. I am sure Marshal Foch would recommend a French reduction also, in fact, withdrawal. Personally I think an agreement could be reached to reduce or withdraw simultaneously which would be the best solution.

11. It is, of course, more than possible that, if the French agreed to withdraw part of their force into a foreign legion, or some means of leaving officers and troops to make certain of their claims to the gendarmerie and other interests, and would make much favour with Angora on the score that they had succeeded in getting the British out, &c. I think their elation would be short lived. They would be extremely unpopular as the only Power of occupation left in Constantinople, and if the Greeks ever threatened Constantinople they would be powerless by themselves. I think they would also be glad to get rid of this commitment.

12. There are other reasons for withdrawal or reduction. The state of armistice has gone on too long. I am constantly forced to point out that a state of armistice still exists, and that I claim certain rights as the Military Governor in occupation. I am constantly reminded, on the other hand, by the Allied High Commissioners that they are the supreme authority, and administer the city. I have never recognised this. The French and Italian High Commissioners never cease to attempt to belittle my position, with the result that it grows increasingly difficult to carry on. The French and Italian generals are directly under their High Commissioners, so cannot speak freely, and always give their opinions under reserve.

13. Frankly speaking, I do not think there is now room for two sets of machinery, viz., the High Commissions and the Allied command. I recognise to the full the support that has been given to me by the British Government and by the British High Commissioner. The difficulty is that the other two Powers do not recognise my authority under martial law. They claim to be the *de facto* Government of Turkey.

14. It is possible that the various secret societies would become more active, and it is certain that the remains of the material in those Turkish depots

under charge of the Allies would go to Angora. I have sent you, under my C.R.A.F., No. 2476 T/2 a record of what we know to have been sent already from the depots here through French, Italian and Turkish sources. This table speaks for itself.

15. Of course it must be recognised that withdrawal will mean loss of much valuable and secret information unless the Foreign Office arrange for it. I give the British High Commissioner the information, and I think it is valuable to him and to His Majesty's Government.

16. If you refer to my memorandum dated the 25th May, 1921 which was attached to the paper put forward by the Chief of the Imperial General Staff and myself, I am sure you will find that I have been consistent in my opinion throughout. It is that you are not getting value for the money you are expending on this force unless a settlement is imminent, which, I regret to say, does not appear to me to be the case. As a purely military proposition we are too weak to enforce our will, and we are too strong merely to show the flag.

17. I am fully aware of what this recommendation means to me and to the others with me, but I cannot conscientiously recommend the retention of this force and these commissions as a military necessity in view of the

fact that we are well advised to come to an agreement with the Allied Governments to withdraw their forces except, perhaps, for a small detachment, which could be withdrawn by ship in case of danger, and entrust the administration to the Allied High Commissioner. As I have said, the control of the military and police is in my hands, and I have never departed from this point of view.

18. In this paper I have attempted to give you the picture as viewed from the point of view of the British High Commissioner. Colonel Gribbin and Lieutenant-Colonel Cornwall respectively. I have received them since I wrote the above, but as they set forth some very powerful arguments in favour of retention, I have not done so. The arguments are outside the strict scope of this command, but the problem is so far-reaching that it is impossible to study it otherwise.

I have &c.

C. H. HARRINGTON, *Commanding-in-Chief
The Allied Forces of Occupation (Turkey)*

E 6319 27 441

No. 160

Director of Military Operations to Foreign Office.—(Received June 25.)

THE Director of Military Operations and Intelligence presents his compliments to the Secretary of State and has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of a report from General Headquarters, Constantinople, giving the views of Major Strovor, D.S.O., R.A., as to the Micro-Asiatic movement in Anatolia.

Major-General Sir William Thwaites thinks this report contains some details which may be new to Sir Eyre Crowe.

War Office, June 24, 1922

Enclosure to No. 160

Report on the Political Situation in Asia Minor.

(Secret.)

Major Strovor, D.S.O., R.A., British military representative, Smyrna, who was present at the conversation between M. Sterghades and Major M. A. B. Johnston, M.C., R.A. :—

After hearing M. Sterghades' balanced ideas on the whole question of Asia Minor, one can understand, what was by no means clear to me before, the real object of the National Defence League in Asia Minor. Seeing that the Athens Government has

* Not enclosed.

was impossible so long as the Nationalists were strong. When revolution comes it will

Dr Syrett informed me that the war cost the Greek Government 120 million drachmas per diem for maintenance, and if expenditure on fighting were included, the cost would be 200 million drachmas. After the payment of urgent creditors, the putting of bank-notes had only produced 500 millions at the outland, and possibly only 150 millions.

2. The French community here received the French High Commissioner, the two French consuls, the Japanese Consul, the Japanese High Commissioner, and the Japanese Consul General. I had the honour to be present at the reception. I understand privately that

General Pellé likewise said that "France was exerting herself to procure a just and honourable peace for Turkey." General Fillionneau alluded to the Turks as "the enemies of yesterday and the allies of to-morrow"—an expression which caused some surprise. It was subsequently toned down in the press to read "the friends of to-morrow." Considerable attention was paid to the Japanese High Commissioner on this occasion.

3. I have been struck of late by the attitude of the French High Commissioner at the conferences which my Italian colleague and I have held with him to discuss questions relating to the proposed commissions of enquiry and to the Near East settlement generally. General Pellé's attitude, both with regard to the last note from Angora and to the proposed commissions of enquiry, has differed from that of my Italian colleague, which may be unwelcome to the Nationalists.

4. I am somewhat puzzled by the general French attitude with regard to the Angora Government. That Government has recently passed a measure confiscating the property belonging to Armenians or Ottoman Greeks who left Cilicia when that province was evacuated by the French forces. This measure is of a confiscatory character and has produced a very unfavourable impression on my colleagues and myself. It has already led to vigorous protests from the Armenian Patriarch, and has been referred by the Allied High Commissioners to the Juridical Commission. As soon as that body has reported, the Allied High Commissioners will meet to discuss the action to be taken. In speaking of it the French High Commissioner went so far as to allude to the Kemalists as "insupportable."

5. Thus the French have a practical illustration of Kemalist bad faith in regard to various matters connected with Cilicia. They cannot help disliking the intimacy prevailing between Angora and Moscow, nor can they be under any illusion as to the attitude of the Kemalists towards the Allied High Commissioners. They are controlled by them as to be inclined to push subversion to Angora to undue lengths.

I have &c.

HORACE RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner

E 6345 567 44]

No. 162

Sir H. Rumbold to the Earl of Halifax.—(Received June 26.)

Yeniköy, June 20, 1922.
My Lord,
I have in reference to my despatch No. 535 of the 12th June, to which I alluded that I called a meeting of the Allied High Commissioners and the Commission of Control on the 16th instant to discuss the question of the sources of revenue which the Turkish Government had proposed to draw upon by the Minister of Finance as to the sources which would be available for the purpose of an advance to enable the Treasury to take over the management of the Turkish Government. Last year this system had been possible, as money had been raised by the Eastern Telegraph Company, Regio, &c.) which had opportunely arrived at the time when the Turkish Government was in a position to make it be, if there were any prospect of similar providential windfalls occurring again this year. But there is no such prospect, or at least none of windfalls sufficiently great to make any appreciable difference. There is not even the expectation of any early peace.

2. In general, my Allied colleagues and I were unanimously of opinion that the Turkish Government must be made fundamentally to reorganise the financial administration. This can be done in two ways—by a serious study and strict enforcement of economies and by the increase in various manners of the existing sources of revenue.
3. The most obvious methods of enforcing economies is by the wholesale retirement of the pre-war officials whose duties have become practically nil since the restriction of the effective authority of the Central Government to the town and vilayet of Constantinople. Such a course will inevitably be unpopular, will be resisted to the utmost by the

Government, and may even lead to disorder. The present revenue is, however, insufficient to meet the requirements of the Provisional Financial Commission of Control to sanction none but priority payments until these supernumerary officials have been placed on half-pay pensions.

3. The existing source of revenues can be augmented in several ways—by the suppression of certain external custom-houses and in general by the application of severe measures for repressing the corruption which is rife throughout the customs administration; and by the levy of a higher landed property tax which could be increased

4. The Commission of Control to draw up comprehensive recommendations in this sense. As the Turkish Government to accept them. There is some likelihood of that acceptance being obtained willingly. The Turks are traditionally incapable of appreciating the interests. There are other considerations which carry greater weight with them. In addition, at the present time the Turks of Constantinople fear the reprobation of any truckling to foreign control will certainly call forth from Angora. Yet

5. It must therefore be anticipated that the utmost pressure will be required to induce the Allies, in general and the Provisional Financial Commission of Control, in particular, have not the machinery and staff at their disposal to exercise forcibly the real control which can alone produce concrete results. Moreover, the time is not yet ripe before any scheme for the reorganisation of the financial services can be drawn up and put into force.

6. I shall forward to you a copy of the report of the Commission of Control on the 16th instant.

I am, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
H. RUMBOLD

E 6348 27 44]

No. 163

Sir H. Rumbold to the Earl of Halifax.—(Received June 26.)

(No. 556.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, June 20, 1922.

It was announced in the local press a couple of weeks ago that preparations were being made for the departure of the Allied High Commissioners from Constantinople. It was stated that the Allied High Commissioners would be leaving the city on the 20th inst.

2. On Wednesday, the 14th instant, however, Mustapha Kemal Pasha did not actually leave the city.

While at Ada Bazar, Mustapha Kemal gave an interview to a correspondent of the "Times." He stated that he had been unable to visit the front, which he had been anxious to visit previously. He had found everything satisfactory. He stated that the Greeks had been removed from the front.

3. He stated that the Greeks had been removed from the front. He stated that the Greeks had been removed from the front. He stated that the Greeks had been removed from the front. He stated that the Greeks had been removed from the front.

4. He stated that the Greeks had been removed from the front. He stated that the Greeks had been removed from the front. He stated that the Greeks had been removed from the front. He stated that the Greeks had been removed from the front.

5. He stated that the Greeks had been removed from the front. He stated that the Greeks had been removed from the front. He stated that the Greeks had been removed from the front. He stated that the Greeks had been removed from the front.

[8975]

38

but that the draft law on the duties and competency of commissioners was now ready, and would shortly be laid before the Assembly. As your Lordship is aware, the question of Cabinet responsibility became a burning one in Angora towards the end of last year and served as a peg on which to hang a strong attack on Mustapha Kemal's

10. There can be little doubt that Mustapha Kemal's visit to the Aida Bazar and Iamud area is due mainly to military considerations. Apprehension was felt a short time ago in Turkish circles lest the Greeks should be contemplating forward action.

a good deal of talk, though principally in Greek circles, so far as I can gather, of an

however, the anxiety caused at Angora by an armed anti-Kemalist movement in the neighbourhood of Bolu. That such a movement exists no longer admits of doubt. I have not hitherto reported on it owing to the difficulty of obtaining accurate information and estimating the importance of the movement.

kind of revolt in the district in question, and that this revolt has attained sufficient proportions to necessitate the despatch of loyal forces to repress it. A certain colonel

command of a unit of the Kemalist army, is said to have put himself at the head of the malcontents. The Greeks are also alleged to have a finger in the pie. According to some accounts, Shevket Bey is acting in the Keverat interest. According to others, the movement is connected with the recent re-entry into activity of the old gang of the Committee of Union and Progress. Yet another theory is that it is an attempt to put into effect the scheme for the establishment of a local anti-Kemalist Government under Greek auspices in Western Asia Minor.

8. The truth probably is that the movement such as it is has brought together desperate elements. The insurgents are said to number 2,000 or 3,000, but I doubt whether it will prove to be beyond the power of the Angora authorities to repress the revolt fairly quickly in the same way in which they have got the better of other local movements lately in the Konia region. At the same time, the movement derives a special importance from the fact that it appears to contain

Constantinople and to the Greek front, and from the existence in the area of large numbers of Circassians, who for various reasons, including their past association with Ferid Pasha's Government and later on with the Greeks, are compromised in the eyes of the Kem

9. M. Claude Favre left for Iamud on the 18th June to visit Mustapha Kemal Pasha. He was sent there in a French destroyer and was accompanied by Haid Bey, the Kemalist representative here.

I am, Sir,
ROBERT RUMBOLD,
High Commissioner.

E 6327 19 44]

No. 164

Sir M. Creithum to the Earl of Halifax—(Received June 26.)

(No. 1483.)

HIS Majesty's Charge d'Affaires at Paris presents his compliments to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and has the honour to acknowledge herewith a copy of a note from M. Poincaré, dated the 24th June respecting proposed communications for the investigation of Turkish and Greek atrocities in Asia Minor.

Paris, June 26, 1922

Enclosure in No. 164

M. Poincaré to Lord Harlinge

Moniteur des A
Paris, le 24 juin 1

M. l'Ambassadeur,

VOTRE Excellence a bien voulu me faire savoir, à la date du 15 de ce mois, qu'elle avait transmis au principal Secrétaire d'Etat de Sa Majesté ma note du 3 juin, relative à

l'envoi de commissions pour faire une enquête sur les atrocités imputables aux Turcs et aux Grecs.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'assurance de ma haute estime et de mon profond respect.

On ne peut pas oublier, d'autre part, que l'accord tripartite avait une portée différente lorsqu'il se basait sur une situation politique de la Turquie telle qu'elle existait à l'époque du Traité de Sévres, tandis que les événements politiques ont depuis complètement changé cette situation.

Évidemment, à l'heure actuelle l'Italie ne se trouve pas seulement dans l'impossibilité de réaliser (au moins pour le moment) les avantages qui lui ont été attribués par le tripartite, mais en vertu d'un article de cet accord (article 6) elle est tenue à reconnaître aux Puissances mandataires, dans les pays détachés de l'ancien Empire ottoman, les droits et les privilèges qu'elle ne peut pas se réserver pratiquement en Asie Mineure.

L'Italie, en d'autres mots, devrait dès maintenant se désintéresser—en certaines limites—économiquement des régions de mandat, tant qu'elle n'aurait pas le moyen de voir pratiquement approuver ses intérêts.

C'est état de choses impose pourtant au Gouvernement italien de chercher quelque moyen de sortir de la situation. La suite des difficultés d'application de l'accord tripartite, qui représentent dans cet équilibre une certaine restriction des droits et intérêts italiens visés par l'article 2 du Pacte de Londres de 1915.

Le Gouvernement italien demande donc au Gouvernement anglais que, tout en restant non changé pour toute éventualité future de ce qui dans les rapports de l'Italie et des Alliés a trait à l'accord tripartite, le Gouvernement britannique consente à ne pas se prévaloir des dispositions de l'article 6 précité relativement aux territoires de mandat de la Palestine et de la Mésopotamie de façon à ne pas entraver les initiatives italiennes dans ces régions.

En vue d'assurer, en outre, des conditions favorables à l'activité italienne en Palestine et en Mésopotamie le Gouvernement italien serait très heureux que le Gouvernement britannique s'engage à admettre avec une bienveillance spéciale et particulière la participation du travail italien aux travaux publics à exécuter dans les amitiés territoriales de mandat. Et cela, en particulier, par l'association du capital italien au capital anglais et au capital américain, et en assurant la protection de la main-d'œuvre italienne qui serait employée en tenant compte des attitudes spéciales dont elle a déjà fait preuve en Orient pour l'exécution des travaux publics tels que ports, chemins de fer, services hydro-électriques, etc.

Les deux Gouvernements pourraient s'engager dès maintenant à stipuler sur la base des principes exposés des accords réglant les moyens de collaboration anglo-italienne dans les travaux publics de Palestine et Mésopotamie moyennant la création d'une certaine quantité de main-d'œuvre italienne à y employer, et la stipulation des dispositions nécessaires pour la protection du travail.

Le Gouvernement italien, en une conséquence de ce qui précède, a l'honneur de donner son consentement aux projets de mandat pour la Palestine et la Mésopotamie présentés par le Gouvernement britannique à la Société des Nations à la condition seulement que les modifications suivantes soient apportées aux textes de ces projets.

Palestine.

Intérêts des Italiens habitant actuellement le pays, et des autres qui s'y fixent en vue pour des motifs de travail ou de caractère religieux.

2. Quant à l'article 9, le Gouvernement italien désire qu'un système de justice mixte appliqué par des magistrats mixtes soit institué en Palestine analogiquement à ce qui a été fait en Égypte. Un certain nombre de places dans la magistrature doit être réservé aux Italiens en relation avec l'importance des intérêts italiens en Palestine.

3. La rédaction actuelle de l'article 2 semble pouvoir se prêter à établir quelque sorte de monopole en faveur des éléments arabes à travers la collaboration de l'Administration de la Palestine avec l'agence arabe. Le Gouvernement italien désire que cet article soit convenablement modifié de façon à éliminer toute possibilité de contradiction avec les propositions ci-dessus formulées relativement à la participation de l'activité italienne en Palestine et à sa collaboration avec l'activité britannique et américaine.

4. Les Italiens ont le droit de s'exprimer en leurs propres méthodes et dans sa propre langue. On pourrait inter-

dire d'écoles et exclusivement dans les langues de chacune de ces catégories seront permises en Palestine, ce qui pourrait entraîner la suppression de toutes les écoles actuelles des ordres religieux.

Le Gouvernement italien demande que ces dispositions soient modifiées dans le but, non seulement de garantir le maintien des écoles déjà existantes, mais d'établir aussi liberté complète d'ouverture de nouvelles écoles, soit appartenant aux communautés religieuses, soit de tout autre genre.

5. L'article 16 établit que, pour motifs d'ordre public et de bon gouvernement, le mandataire pourra exercer le contrôle sur toutes les institutions religieuses et sur les propriétés religieuses.

Le Gouvernement italien demande que les cas d'intervention dans les affaires intérieures de ces institutions soient mieux déterminés et le plus possible restreints.

6. La dernière partie de l'article 18 a déjà reçu application par l'accord douanier franco-anglais concernant les territoires de Syrie et Palestine avant que la Société des Nations ait discuté les projets de mandat. Si la Société des Nations approuvait le projet de mandat, le Gouvernement italien demanderait que les dispositions de l'article 18 soient modifiées de façon à ne pas entraver les initiatives italiennes dans ces régions.

27, 28 du projet de mandat pour la Palestine par le Foreign Office à l'Ambassade d'Italie à Londres par sa note du 23 juin courant, il se déclare pleinement satisfait des modifications apportées par le Gouvernement britannique aux articles susdits.

Le Gouvernement italien désire, toutefois:

1) Recevoir, lui aussi, l'assurance contenue dans le projet de traité anglo-américain (Italie à Londres) que "rien ne sera fait dans l'administration de la Palestine qui puisse porter atteinte aux droits civils ou religieux des communautés non juives dans cette région."

Que les missions religieuses italiennes, leurs écoles et les institutions hospitalières, qui exemptent ces institutions des taxes spécialement foncières et analogues aux missions religieuses et institutions d'autres nations.

Le Gouvernement italien note, en fin, dans l'attente de connaître les modifications qui, d'après la réponse contenue dans la note précitée du Foreign Office, seront apportées à l'article 16 du projet de mandat.

Il manifestera alors son point de vue à ce propos.

Mésopotamie

Le Gouvernement italien a confiance que le Gouvernement britannique voudra modifier les articles 5, 18, 20 du projet de mandat pour la Mésopotamie analogiquement à ce qui a été fait en Palestine.

Extrême

pour les articles 9, 13, 16 et 18 du projet pour la Palestine, le Gouvernement italien présente des propositions identiques pour les articles 6, 8, 10, 11 du projet de mandat pour la Mésopotamie.

Il a été exposé ci-dessus relativement à la participation du travail italien à l'exécution des travaux publics et à sa collaboration avec l'activité britannique et américaine.

Les accords que le Gouvernement britannique se propose de stipuler sur la base de cet article avec le Gouvernement de Mésopotamie devraient tenir compte des intentions éventuelles anglo-italiennes.

Quant à l'article 16 concernant l'éventualité d'autonomie locale pour les zones en prévalence kurdes, le Gouvernement italien doit faire remarquer que, au cas où la Société des Nations consentait à admettre un régime spécial pour ces zones, le projet relatif de systématisation administrative devrait être soumis préalablement à la Société des Nations, car il serait inadmissible que les zones kurdes soient soustraites au mandat.

Le Gouvernement italien ne doit négliger aucune tentative pour essayer d'obtenir aussi quelque avantage pratique dans la zone d'Asie Mineure réservée par l'accord tripartite à l'activité économique italienne, le Gouvernement royal désirerait vivement de stipuler avec le Gouvernement britannique un engagement spécial dans le but d'appuyer à l'avenir auprès du Gouvernement turc les demandes de concessions économiques que le Gouvernement italien ou les groupes financiers italiens pourraient présenter au Gouvernement ottoman pour réaliser en quelque façon, même partielle, la priorité italienne dans ladite zone. En conséquence de cet engagement particulier anglo-italien, on pourrait stipuler d'autres accords entre les deux pays dans le but d'éliminer les différences d'intérêt économique qui pourraient se vérifier à l'avenir entre les initiatives italiennes pour le développement de l'Anatolie et les entreprises britanniques dans la zone de Smyrne. Ces accords devraient avoir principalement pour objet les conditions du trafic et les questions des chemins de fer reliant la zone italienne à la zone de Smyrne.

Le Gouvernement italien désirerait, en outre, vivement la possibilité d'un accord anglo-italien en vue d'obtenir et d'effectuer l'exploitation des pétroles dans les vilayets nord-orientaux de la Turquie. Cet accord devrait être en relation avec la lettre sur les pétroles adressée à Gênes par Mr. Lloyd George et M. Schanzer.

CHAPTER III. PALESTINE AND SYRIA, MESOPOTAMIA AND ARABIA.

E 397 78 65]

No. 166

Lord Hardinge to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received January 31.)

(No. 89)

HIS Majesty's Ambassador at Paris presents his compliments to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and has the honour to transmit herewith copy of a note from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, dated the 14th January, respecting the Palestine mandate.

Paris, January 10, 1922

Enclosure in No. 166.

Note from French Ministry for Foreign Affairs

M l'Ambassadeur,

Paris, le 9 janvier 1922

VOTRE Excellence a bien voulu me communiquer, le 29 décembre dernier, une lettre en date du même jour par laquelle le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté a exposé au Gouvernement des Etats-Unis les raisons pour lesquelles il est malade de voir, en raison de la situation spéciale de la Palestine, demander à la Société des Nations d'approuver, dès sa prochaine session, les termes du mandat relatif à ce pays, en attendant que l'entrée en vigueur du Traité de Paix avec la Turquie permette d'en demander la consécration définitive.

Le Gouvernement français a l'honneur de vous adresser ci-joint, en réponse à votre lettre, une note qui expose les raisons pour lesquelles le Gouvernement français ne peut pas accepter la proposition du Gouvernement britannique relative au mandat pour la Palestine.

Le Gouvernement français exprime le vœu que le représentant du Gouvernement français au Conseil de la Société des Nations reçoive l'instruction de soutenir la proposition du représentant du Gouvernement britannique relative au mandat pour la Palestine.

J'ai l'honneur de faire savoir à votre Excellence que le Gouvernement français s'associe entièrement—comme il l'a, d'ailleurs, déjà fait à propos des mandats (B)—aux assurances données au Gouvernement des Etats-Unis tant au sujet de l'égalité de traitement réservée aux ressortissants et aux sociétés américaines en raison de la participation des Etats-Unis à la guerre qu'au sujet des moyens d'assurer cette égalité indépendamment du fait que les Etats-Unis sont demeurés en dehors de la Société des Nations.

En ce qui concerne les modifications que, pour donner satisfaction au désir des Etats-Unis, le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté est disposé à apporter sur certains points au mandat pour la Palestine, le Gouvernement français doit préciser les observations suivantes :

1. La réserve figurant au seul mandat pour la Syrie sera également supprimée et n'y aura plus de place.

Le Gouvernement français est disposé à soutenir le Gouvernement britannique en ce qui concerne la réserve figurant au seul mandat pour la Syrie sera également supprimée et n'y aura plus de place.

Quant au rétablissement des Capitulations, au cas où le régime des mandats

prendrait fin, le Gouvernement français est d'accord pour donner satisfaction au Gouvernement américain en introduisant dans les mandats une stipulation à cet effet.

2. En ce qui concerne l'égalité économique et les objections élevées par le Gouvernement américain contre la situation spéciale réservée à l'organisation sioniste, le Gouvernement français est disposé à soutenir le point de vue du Gouvernement britannique, étant entendu que les ressortissants et sociétés français bénéficieront en Palestine des mêmes droits et avantages qui seraient reconnus aux ressortissants et sociétés américains.

Pour ce qui est des établissements scolaires et charitables, le Gouvernement français prend acte volontiers de l'assurance donnée au Gouvernement américain que l'article 9 de la Convention franco-anglaise du 23 décembre 1920 ne doit pas, dans l'intention du Gouvernement britannique, faire obstacle au développement de ces établissements.

Que chacun des deux contractants a pris dans cet article de ne pas ouvrir de nouvelles écoles dans les territoires soumis au mandat de l'autre Gouvernement contractant. Cependant, pour le cas où serait reconnu aux États-Unis et sous doute à leur suite à l'Italie, à l'Espagne et aux autres États—le droit d'ouvrir de nouvelles écoles en Palestine et en Mésopotamie, le Gouvernement français doit faire observer qu'il ne pourrait admettre que ce droit lui fût refusé à lui seul. Il a accepté de ne pas ouvrir de nouvelles écoles en Palestine et en Mésopotamie dans la pensée que les tiers accepteraient une même limitation de leur activité, et il presume que telle était également la pensée du Gouvernement britannique en acceptant de ne pas ouvrir de nouvelles écoles en Syrie et au Liban. Il considère, par suite, que, si le droit d'ouvrir de nouvelles écoles en Palestine et en Mésopotamie était reconnu à des tierces Puissances, l'article 9 de la convention du 23 décembre 1920 ne ferait pas obstacle au bénéfice, pour chacun des deux contractants, du traitement accordé à celle de ces tierces Puissances qui serait la plus favorable.

En réponse de ces observations, j'ai l'honneur de faire savoir que le Gouvernement français est prêt à inviter son représentant à donner tout son appui au représentant dans ce conseil du Gouvernement.

Veuillez agréer, etc.

E. DE LA PARETTI DE LA ROCCA.

E 700 78 657

No 187

Draft Treaty with the King of Irak, January 10, 1922.—(Communicated by Colonial Office, January 12)

In the name of God the Merciful, the Compassionate.

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India.

His Majesty the King of Irak

Whereas on the 23rd August, 1921, his said Majesty the Emir Faisal Ibn Hussein was by vote of the people elected to be King of Irak; and

Whereas the said Majesty the King of Irak has accepted the said election and has taken the oath of allegiance to the said Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India;

purpose the high contracting parties have appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India.

Sir Percy Zachariah Cox, G.C.M.G., G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I., His Majesty's High Commissioner and consul-general at Bagdad

His Majesty the King of Irak

His Highness Sayid Sir Abdurrahman, G.R.E., Naqib-al-Asraf, Bagdad;

who, having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows—

1. His Britannic Majesty undertakes, subject to the other provisions of this treaty, to provide advice and assistance to Irak during the period of the present treaty. His Britannic Majesty shall be represented in Irak by a High Commissioner and consul-general assisted by the necessary staff.

2. His Majesty the King of Irak undertakes that for the period of the present treaty no gazetted official of other than Irak nationality shall be appointed by the Irak Government without the concurrence of His Britannic Majesty. A separate agreement shall regulate the numbers and conditions of employment of British officials so appointed.

3. His Majesty the King of Irak agrees to frame for submission to the representatives of the people of Irak and to give effect to an organic law which shall be in conformity with the provisions of the present treaty, and shall take account of the rights, interests and wishes of all populations inhabiting Irak. This organic law shall ensure to all complete freedom of conscience and the free exercise of all forms of worship, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals. It shall provide that no discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Irak on the ground of race, religion or language, and shall secure that the right of each community to maintain its own schools for the education of its own members in its own language (while conforming to such educational requirements of a general nature as the Government of Irak may impose) shall not be denied or impaired. It shall prescribe the constitutional procedure whether legislative or executive, by which decisions will be taken on all matters of importance, including those involving questions of fiscal, financial and military policy.

4. His Majesty the King of Irak agrees to be guided by the advice of His Britannic Majesty, tendered through the High Commissioner, on all such matters of importance as relate to the internal policy of the Irak Government so long as that Government is under obligations to the Government of His Britannic Majesty; and on all such other matters of importance as affect the interests of His Britannic Majesty, for the whole period of the treaty.

His Majesty the King of Irak may appoint an agent to represent him in London. Elsewhere His Britannic Majesty undertakes the protection of Irak nationals abroad. His Majesty the King of Irak will himself issue exequaturs to representatives of foreign Powers in Irak after His Britannic Majesty has agreed to their appointment.

6. His Britannic Majesty undertakes to use his good offices to secure the admission of Irak to membership of the League of Nations as soon as possible.

7. His Britannic Majesty undertakes to provide such support and assistance to the armed forces of His Majesty the King of Irak as may from time to time be agreed upon by the high contracting parties. A separate agreement regulating the extent and conditions of such support and assistance shall be concluded between the high contracting parties and communicated to the Council of the League of Nations.

8. No territory in Irak shall be ceded or leased to or in any way placed under the control of any foreign Power; this shall not prevent His Majesty the King of Irak from making such arrangements as may be necessary for the accommodation of foreign representatives.

9. His Majesty the King of Irak undertakes that in judicial matters he will accept and give effect to such reasonable safeguards for the interests of foreigners as His Britannic Majesty may consider that the abrogation of the immunities and privileges which they enjoyed under the regime of the Capitulations necessitates.

10. The high contracting parties agree to conclude such separate agreements as may be necessary to secure the execution of any treaties, agreements or undertakings in which His Britannic Majesty is under obligation to see carried out in respect of Irak. His Majesty the King of Irak undertakes to bring in the legislation necessary to ensure the execution of these agreements. Such agreements shall be communicated to the Council of the League of Nations.

11. There shall be no discrimination in Irak against the nationals of any State member of the League of Nations (including companies incorporated under the laws of such State) as compared with British nationals or those of any foreign State in matters concerning taxation, commerce or navigation, the exercise of industries or professions or in the treatment of merchant vessels or civil aircraft. Nor shall there be any discrimination in Irak against goods originating in or destined for any of the said

States. There shall be freedom of transit under equitable conditions across Iraq territory.

12. No measure shall be taken in Iraq to obstruct or interfere with missionary enterprise or to discriminate against any missionary on the ground of his religious belief or nationality, provided that such enterprise is not prejudicial to public order and good government.

13. His Majesty the King of Iraq undertakes to co-operate in so far as social, religious and other conditions may permit, in the execution of any common policy adopted by the League of Nations for preventing and combating disease, including diseases of plants and animals.

14. His Majesty the King of Iraq undertakes to secure the enactment within twelve months of the coming into force of this treaty and to ensure the execution of a law based on the contents of article 421 of Part XIII of the Treaty of Commerce between the United Kingdom and the Kingdom of Iraq. This law shall replace the former Ottoman law of antiquities, and shall ensure equality of treatment in the matter of archaeological research to the nationals of all States members of the League of Nations.

15. A separate agreement shall regulate the financial relations between the high contracting parties. It shall provide on the one hand for the transfer by His Britannic Majesty's Government to the Government of Iraq of such works of public utility as may be agreed upon and for the rendering by His Britannic Majesty's Government of such financial assistance as may from time to time be considered necessary for Iraq and on the other hand for the progressive liquidation by the Government of Iraq of all liabilities incurred. Such agreement shall be communicated to the Council of the League of Nations.

16. So far as is consistent with his international obligations, His Britannic Majesty undertakes to place no obstacle in the way of the association of Iraq for customs or other purposes with such Arab States as may desire it.

17. This treaty shall come into force from the date of ratification by His Britannic Majesty and His Majesty King Faisal, and shall remain in force for twenty years. One year before the expiration of that period the high contracting parties will consult together as to the modifications which experience has shown to be desirable. If such negotiations have not been concluded within the space of one year the points at issue shall be submitted to arbitration, and pending the result of such arbitration the provisions of the present treaty shall remain in force.

18. Any difference that may arise between the high contracting parties as to the interpretation of the provisions of this treaty may be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice provided for by article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. Should there be any discrepancy between the English and Arabic texts of this treaty, the English shall be taken as the authoritative version.

E 397/78/85]

No. 168.

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Lord Hardinge (Paris)

(By Bag.)

No. 101

(Telegraphic.)

Foreign Office, January 12, 1922

YOUR despatch No. 89 of 10th January, United States and Palestine mandate

In order to ensure French support on Council of the League, should United States Government waive their objections to Palestine mandate before the conclusion of meeting of council at Geneva, please thank French Government at once for their assistance on the three points raised in their note of 9th January.

E 548 248 91

No. 169

Acting Consul Graffley-Smith to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received January 15.)

(No. 3.)

(Telegraphic.) R.

Jeddah, January 15, 1922.

I HAVE the honour to inform King Hussein for His Majesty's Government.

"My respect for equal rights and their inherent equality are the basis of my Government's policy and decision about articles of Lawrence Treaty till my son Abdullah reaches you and pending perusal of my letters, which he brings with supplementary information and explanations given to him."

E 656 656 91,

No. 170

Vice-Consul Graffley-Smith to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received January 18, 1922.)

(No. 103. Secret.)

My Lord,

Jeddah, December 31, 1921

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith the Jeddah report for the period the 11th to 31st December, 1921.

Copies of this despatch and report have been sent to Cairo, Bagdad, Jerusalem, Aden and Suez.

I have, &c.

Acting British Agent and Consul

Enclosure 1 to No. 170.

Jeddah Report, December 11 to 31, 1921.

(Secret.)

MAJOR W. E. MARSHALL, M.C., R.A.M.C., left Jeddah for Paris on the 10th December. The British vice-consul returned on the 10th December from leave of absence in the United Kingdom.

Visit of Emir Ali

The Emir Ali, accompanied by Sheikh Faid-el-Khatib, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, arrived from Mecca on the 24th December to bid farewell to the King.

In the course of conversation, his Highness referred to the

"Haram," and warning him to get out of Khedbar soon, since he was "not so strong as Ibn Rashid." The Khedbar garrison consists of 200 soldiers and

He appeared to view the possibility of a successful Wahabi enterprise in Syria with interest.

Arab, and, indeed, in the whole Moslem world, enjoyed by its possessor.

He believed that the tribal traditions of the Shammar would prove too strong for proselytizers from Nejd, and prophesied an early revolt against the new régime in Jaufr and Hail.

Mecca.

The party left Jeddah for Mecca on the 26th December

Dr. Munir-ad Din, the Indian vice-consul, visited Mecca from the 1st to the 10th December.

89/5]

3 P 2

his respects to the King. Every courtesy was shown him by His Majesties Faysal and Zeid.

The road between Jeddah and Mecca is patrolled by about 500 Arab irregulars. Bread is sold by the municipality of Mecca at 5 halalas a loaf (4 halalas = 1 Turkish piastre) the Government issuing flour to bakers and paying them a fixed wage. The bakers offered to bake for sale at 4 halalas a loaf, but this the Government have refused. Bakers are forbidden, under heavy penalty to bake on their own account or to sell at a price below the Government rate.

The Government are active in recruiting for the army, but volunteers cannot be forthcoming in satisfactory numbers, since Takrimis (Hawass, Frelas and other Central African tribesmen) are being impressed for military service.

The King, in conversation with Dr Munir-ul-Din, referred to the complication of the Jeddah Mecca railway. He proposed to compensate the 70,000 camel men plying between Mecca and Jeddah by settling along them in agriculture. The social estimate of their numbers and the singularity of the solution are alike characteristic.

His Majesty insisted that Dr. Munir-ul-Din should re-visit the country by car, and he therefore travelled down with Ali Rida Pasha-el-Rakaby, who was referred to in the last report. The car broke down and Ali Rida Pasha the hours of waiting with suggestive comments on Arab affairs, the urgent need of a Jeddah Mecca railway, the excellence of the Hashimite troops and the success of this year's pilgrimage, he proceeded to deplore the opposition in India to King Hussein, with particular reference to the Khalifate question. He expressed the opinion that influence might well be brought to bear on Indian pilgrims and others by the Indian vice-consul who was in a position to represent the essential wrongness of a Khalifate held by any outside the propiety dynasty. Dr. Munir-ul-Din has no Arabic, and this somewhat surprising definition of his duties was conveyed to him through an interpreter.

Sheikh Fand-el-Khatib referred pointedly to the King's ambitions in this direction in connection with aeroplanes, tanks, armoured cars and the like were probably inspired less by a

faithful. His territorial ambitions, his very great personal ambition, are but aspects of the same desire. He is convinced that, given material power and, with it, the prestige indispensable to the public propagation of a claim, his claim would prove acceptable to

obtain the solid advantages preliminarily essential. His frequent public disclaimers of personal ambition have only the value of propaganda. Publicly to commit himself to, as things at present stand, impossible.

So far as his relations with His Majesty's Government are concerned, he still appears to be more amicably disposed to Great Britain than to other foreign Powers, but even that sentiment is relative, and he finds continual difficulty in giving proof of it without compromising what must always be for him the main issue—the position and prestige in the Moslem world. Hence constant dilemma and consequent instability. For his inclination, where alternatives present themselves to him, is towards the facts we ask him to face, but towards the dream he desires to realise.

Route to Medina.

The Yambo Medina road is closed for transport purposes, being occupied by Ahamda tribesmen, with whom the Subh are said to be co-operating. An Ahamda caravan was recently looted by Juhennas near Yambo gate, and a party of Ahamdas in Yambo itself robbed of a large sum of money. The Juhenna looting party is said to have acted on instructions from Mecca.

The King has now ordered all the goods to be sent to Medina. The export of goods from Yambo to the interior is prohibited, presumably in the hope of starving the Ahamdas into submission.

Travellers by dhows from Jeddah to Rabegh take a man from that part of the coast as on the dhow by his friends. The fee paid is 120 Turkish piastres. Some before the traveller ventures from Rabegh to Medina.

Foreign Commercial Enterprise.

I travelled from Suez to Jeddah (11th-15th December) with M. T. M. Pastorini whose activities were referred to in Rome despatches. He was tolerably communicative, but his statements are worth

He volunteered the information that he had had his passport vized in Egypt for Port Sudan and had booked his passage on to that place, as he did not wish it to be known in Egypt that he was going to Jeddah. He only stayed in Jeddah three days, and then proceeded to Massawa by Italian steamer.

He has approached the Hashimite Government at various times for different concessions—aeroplanes, motor transport between Jeddah and Mecca; also water condensing, with a plant carried by his little steamer the "Mascotte" (now lying at Massawa), and capable of yielding from 30 to 40 tons daily. This water he proposed to sell to the Government at 11. per ton. The "Mascotte" could have lain either in

the King.

In 1910 he offered the King a fleet of eight motor-cars and a 30 per cent. share in the profits of a motor transport system between Jeddah and Mecca. The cars were to be run as a Mahommedan concern by an Italian agent in Jeddah. This offer also was refused by the King, and Pastorini has now made over all his rights in this matter to Messrs. Khawilwan, of Jeddah, who, as reported in my despatch No. 1, Overseas Trade, of the 11th April last, are his chief rivals for this mechanical transport concession.

The Caudron and Farman aeroplanes referred to in Jeddah Report for the period ending the 10th September last were purchased by Pastorini in Italy for 200,000 liras and sold to King Hussein for 2,500,000 gold for the six. Pastorini got a wiggling from the Italian Ministry for Foreign Affairs for his share in this transaction, but he excused himself to them on the ground that Great Britain had sent aeroplanes and a pilot (Captain Brooke) to King Hussein before he himself began competing, and that, in any case, aeroplanes of the Caudron and Farman types are militarily valueless.

During Pastorini's absence from Jeddah, his partner, Avv. Amodeo, received payment from the King for three aeroplanes, on the understanding that he would proceed to provide the King with a mounting machine. Amodeo has left Jeddah, and Pastorini has lost all trace of him—also of the money.

Pastorini said that the King had ordered twenty aeroplanes from Schumacher, and was also trying to purchase 2,000 aeroplanes locally.

In this context I was informed on the 26th December by Sheikh Fand-el-Khatib that in fact Schumacher had written offering to sell the King twenty aeroplanes, and that the King had refused, while thanking him for his offer. The King had, however, asked Schumacher to send him some pilots and mechanics.

Schumacher is a German-Swiss, well known during the war to the intelligence authorities in Cairo. His entry into Hedjaz affairs probably dates from the visit to this country of Baron Plyffer, his compatriot and personal friend, mentioned in Major Marshall's despatch No. 35 of the 30th April last.

Pastorini referred, in the course of conversation, to the oil possibilities north of El Wajh, to a seam of coal of almost the same calorific power as Natal coal 700 calories V. 040., but with an admixture of sulphur, running from 80 miles inland of Mecca to the sea, and to the prospect of a profitable motor transport concession between Mecca and Akaba. He describes himself as a mineralogist and crystallographer, he is, in fact, an adventurer, with considerable faith in his own capabilities. He spoke of, by representations to the Italian Ministry for Foreign Affairs and propaganda in the Italian press before the war, thwarted a British group who were in treaty to build a Berbera Harar railway to exploit Central Abyssinia. Abyssinia was, under this arrangement, to receive Berbera and another Somali port. Whatever truth there may or may not be in this story, his relation of it to me suggests that excess of scruple is not likely to characterise Italian competitive methods in the Red Sea.

(a.) The Director-General of Customs, Jeddah, now collects 3 Turkish piastres per package landed at Jeddah over and above the ordinary customs dues. This supplementary charge is said to be for the formation of a fund to provide for the cleaning and lighting of the streets of Jeddah.

(b.) The French representative returned from Mecca on the 15th December. His attitude towards the local Government is markedly more friendly than it was. When some thirty Arab irregulars were killed by hail and floods earlier in the month, he both

wrote and called officially on the local authorities to express his condolences. His change of attitude has been the subject of public comment.

(c) The King has sent to this agency to see and return a copy of a news paper "Ash Sharq" ("The East"), of Buenos Aires, No. 2 of the 27th November, containing the usual criticisms of himself as a traitor to the cause of Arab unity and Islam. The writer, however, describes King Hussein as father of the Arabs, and adds that the hopes of all are set upon him rather than on his sons. I should not be surprised to discover that much of this pseudo-hostile stuff published in South American and Syrian newspapers is written by the King himself and distributed from Mecca.

The rumour is strongly current in Mecca that the King has signed a treaty with Mustapha Kamal, and that a delegation under the leadership of Izzet Pasha, described as Minister of War of the Ankara Government, is very shortly visiting Mecca. (Rumour linked to the Hurriyat on Friday the 16th instant in festive expectation of a reference in the Khatha to Sultan Mohiuddin as Khaliph, but no such evidence of the truth of the rumour was, of course, forthcoming. Transport for the delegation is supposed to have been arranged on a French steamer.

(d) A leading mutawwil in Mecca said that the King was spending 5,000,000 per diem on the tribes and on irregular gendarmes.

(e) Many people in Mecca believe that the King is on the point of abdicating, and that the Emir Ali will then succeed him. This is probably a hope rather than a

(f) Sayed Mohammed-a-Sagoff, Sheikh-us-Suda, referred to in Jeddah Report for the period ending the 10th July and in the 13th Aden news letter dated the 1st November last, is said to be a prisoner in the Yemen, but opinions differ as to whether the Emir or the Imam is responsible for his imprisonment.

"Al Qibla"

No. 541 reports that certain Syrian fugitives have been enrolled in the Hashemite army and police, and contains an official proclamation in which the Government disclaims all responsibility for the Bedouin attacks on Persian and Indian pilgrims on the borders of the Government. The Government deplore the suggestion that they desire to entice pilgrims to the Hedjaz for the material benefit of Hedjazis.

received from Arab notables about the Hedjaz. The rumour is categorically denied, and extracts from King Hussein's famous letter to Sir H. McMahon are served up again, with omission of any hostile reference to Turkey. The Government anticipate critical developments owing to the payment by Great Britain of a subsidy to Ibn Saud, but the article closes with depreciation of the idea of a war with Ibn Saud, since such conflict would only lead to the shedding of Moslem blood.

No. 542 announces the grant to Ab Rida Pasha-el-Rikaby of the first class of the Order of Al Nakhla.

No. 543 gives prominence to an article from the "Lisan-al-Arab" of Jerusalem (No. 115), discussing Ibn Saud's capture of Hail, in which the Jerusalem editor prophesies that Tarab and Khurma will soon meet with a similar fate, and

assemble a powerful army, capable not only of protecting the frontiers of the Hedjaz, but of restoring peace and order throughout the peninsula by compelling the like of Ibn Saud to lie low. All Arab officers are called on to volunteer in this army.

"Lisan-al-Arab"—to comment on the proclamation in No. 541 of "Al Qibla" quoted above.

In this issue "patriotic fellow-countrymen" are invited to subscribe for shares in the "Industrial Enterprise Company." The board formed to collect subscriptions is represented in Mecca by the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs and in Jeddah by the Chamber of Commerce.

L. B. GRAFFTEY-SMITH.

Shipping Intelligence to December 31, 1921

The following steamers arrived at and departed from Jeddah between the 11th and 31st December, 1921—

Steamship	Flag	From—	To—	Arrived	Left	Cargo, discharged
Iskandariya	British	Port Sudan	Suez	Dec. 11	Dec. 12	Passenger, 1000
Masrurah	"	Suez	"	"	"	"
Masrurah	Italian	Masrurah	"	"	"	"
Asiatic	"	Suez	"	"	"	"
Masrurah	British	Port Sudan	"	"	"	"
Iskandariya	"	"	"	"	"	"

2 700 78 65

No. 71

Foreign Office to Colonial Office

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 10, 1922

I AM directed by the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to state that he has had under consideration the draft despatch which Mr. Secretary Churchill proposes to address to His Majesty's High Commissioner in Bagdad, together with the revised draft (henceforth to be called the draft of the 10th January) of the treaty with King Feisal.

2. Lord Curzon is prepared to concur in the terms of both documents, subject to the following observations regarding article 10 of the draft of the 10th January. The reason for his Lordship's criticism of this article is his doubt whether in its present form it is adequate to safeguard the position of His Majesty's Government vis-à-vis of the League of Nations, though he is fully alive to the difficulty in which Mr. Churchill finds himself owing to the rapid march of events in Iraq and the complete failure hitherto experienced to make any progress at Geneva. In view, however, of the essential need of making some progress in the matter, Lord Curzon considers that, while article 10 of the treaty in its present form is undoubtedly one which entails some carefully handled, it is to be anticipated that objection will be raised at Geneva, and that the council of that body is not likely to acquiesce in the treaty as a satisfactory fulfilment of our relations under the mandate with King Feisal should the Secretariat of the League report adversely upon it.

To avoid any possible difficulty from this source Lord Curzon therefore suggests, for Mr. Churchill's consideration, the desirability of delegating some senior member of Mr. Churchill's department to proceed to Geneva to discuss the draft with the head of the Mandates Section of the Secretariat of the League and to secure, if possible, an assurance that the treaty will be reported on as acceptable. In view of the fact that His Majesty's Government might at any moment say that if the Council of the League make difficulties for Great Britain in Mesopotamia Great Britain will refuse the mandate altogether and leave the League to face the chaos which would ensue as the result, Lord Curzon does not consider that the difficulties to be encountered at Geneva would be insuperable. Should Mr. Churchill decide to adopt this course, Lord Curzon will be happy to instruct Mr. Forbes Adam to accompany Mr. Churchill's delegate to Geneva for the purpose of explaining the matter to the Secretariat of the League.

I am, &c.

LANCELOT OLIPHANT

Foreign Office, January 24, 1922.

His Majesty's Government have been telegraphed by King Hussein to Prime Minister:—

Yusuf Ali's hope of securing eleventh-hour modifications must be accepted or rejected as it stands.

E 726 '726 89

No 173

Foreign Office, January 26, 1922

Dear Excellency,

I have the honor to inform you that I learn from His Majesty's Acting High Commissioner for Syria that the Syrians established in Egypt should be regarded as French-protected persons.

2. In existing
in urging the Egyptian Government to surrender
constitute a considerable section of the population of Egypt, until such
under the Treaty of Sevres when it has come into force.

I have &c
CURZON OF KEDLESTON

E 1120 113 91

No. 174

Major Marshall to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston — (Received January 31)

Mr. [redacted] *Craigsm. at Perth, January 30, 1922*
I HAVE just received your letter of December 29, 1921. The
report of the other members of the London League of Health and
Medical Education Society has not yet reached me.

I want the copies of these reports to be sent to Jeddah and to Egypt, Palestine, Khartoum, Aden, India, Iraq and Singapore.

W. E. MARSHALL, Major, R A M C.,
British Agent and Consul at Jeddah

According to our disembarkation returns 37 255 pilgrims came to Jeddah for the 1921 pilgrimage. This is 1 320 less than the number disembarked here in 1920. The following is a list of the places where they embarked and the number disembarked:

Strait Settlements	10,702
Dutch East Indies				2,624
Sumatra				1,000
Batavia				1,023
Medan				1,577
Bandung				1,000
Malacca				400
Lagos (Emir of Katsina and staff)				100
Total	15,325

The Arab returns show a total of 60,746, made up by nationalities as follows:—

Javanese (includes all Malays)	..	35 171
Indians	..	11,633
Soudanese	..	5,730
Egyptians	..	3,780
Persians and Mesopotamians	..	3,088
From Mawoon	..	425
From Zanibar	..	48
Yemeni	..	12
Total		60,787

[illegible]

The Javanese and Singapore pilgrims arrived early and went to Medina before the Hajj. All the caravans went and returned safely, and up to the time of the Hajj public security between Mecca and Medina was undisturbed. However, as the Hajj season approached, and as unfavourable reports were received. The majority of the Indian pilgrims, the Egyptians, the Persians, and the Moroccans, who were expected to arrive in Medina in the latter part of the Hajj season, did not do so. It was concluded that the Hashimite Government had lost all control of the situation, and what would otherwise have been a very successful pilgrimage was marred by the experiences of these unfortunate caravans.

This trouble appears to have been caused by two things--

1. In previous years the Persian pilgrims were carried by the Dahawir tribe (Beni Saleh) at a higher rate than the others. King Hussein, who this year was very kind to the Shia pilgrims, gave them to the Auf tribe, with the result that the Dahawir tribe surrounded Medina, kept the Persians therein and even tried to take the city, an event which has never happened before.
2. Some mismanagement in the payment of Akhaws, which is a special tax collected from the inland Persians and paid to various tribes (mainly

Medina. It would appear that some of this was misappropriated by the mutawifis and mekawiya because the Bedouin visited the various caravans looking out the number of Persians in each caravan.

The pilgrims are entirely at the mercy of these mutawifis and mekawiya. They stop the caravan and demand money either to placate robbers or on some other pretext and threaten to leave the pilgrims stranded unless the money is paid. As the pilgrims are in a strange and barbarous country this threat is usually sufficient.

There is no doubt that a certain number of pilgrims were killed. Hassan Ibn Abdul Khalik, of Bagdad said his mother was killed by a bullet just outside Medina, and Ali-el Hadji Hassan Shahit, the Reis of the Belediyah of Kut-el Amara, said that, in his opinion, sixty persons were killed between Mecca and Medina. These included African pilgrims who had been wounded by bullets, knives and sticks.

The Persian consul in Jeddah, M. Hussein Khan, was so angry at the treatment of the Persian pilgrims that he sent a memorandum to all the foreign consulates informing them that the Persian pilgrims had all been plundered.

The Hashemite Government in 'El Killa, No. 541 of the 8th December, 1921, admitted that certain attacks had occurred, but stated that they did not hold themselves responsible for them, and that no pilgrims had appealed to them on that account. The Government arrived at Jeddah safely. This latter statement, with the exception of

for the last caravans to return via Yembo. It is probable, however, that the pilgrims themselves did not insist on going by that route.

2—Public Health

The health of the pilgrimage throughout was good and the death rate low. Some of the Javanese caravans, who went to Medina before the Hadj, suffered a good deal from the heat, and a considerable number died. With the exception of an outbreak of smallpox and a few cases of typhoid fever, no infectious disease occurred.

Smallpox broke out in Mecca some time in August. The disease was widespread in and around Mecca, but the cases were, for the most part, mild and the mortality low. Only eight cases occurred in Jeddah: the first two on the 22nd September and the last on the 2nd October. Four of these cases were pilgrims. The disease is still present in Mecca, and cases are still coming in from the country east and south of Mecca. It will be necessary, therefore, to have all pilgrims for next year's Hadj carefully revaccinated, and I have already telegraphed to Singapore to this effect.

Reports received show that the medical arrangements of the Hashemite Government were totally inadequate, their hospitals insufficiently staffed and badly equipped, and with a deplorable and inexcusable lack of ordinary medicines. The Arab Government, in opposition to the Indian Pilgrimage Hospital, opened a hospital beside it, but it never received any patients, and there were no medicines.

A doctor, a capable and well-informed Egyptian, refused to stay with the Arab Government and left the country soon after the pilgrimage. I have received the following report on the sanitary conditions in Mecca:

I have received the following report on the sanitary conditions in Mecca:

The sanitary state of the town is deplorable and very sad. The hospitals are in such a state that they should not be called hospitals but stables. The orderlies are incompetent and not even capable of giving medicines to the sick. There is no order. The dispensary resembles a grocer's shop. The pharmacist is incapable, and cannot now read or write because of cataract. Cases of smallpox are in the same hospital as those suffering from ordinary diseases. In one hospital there is no castor oil and practically no medicines.

After the pilgrimage, Dr. Mohamed Hussein returned to the Hedjaz, and the King put him in charge of the medical arrangements in Mecca during the absence of the British Medical Officer. He has arranged a separate building for cases of smallpox, and is bringing order and discipline into the hospitals.

The conditions in Medina are described in Inspector Said Hassan's report, and in the report by Captain Salamutullah, M.C., I.M.S., both of which are attached to this report.

3—Shipping

The shipping arrangements for the Javanese pilgrims were excellent. The Hadj there was a steady stream of Blue Funnel and Dutch boats arriving daily, or every second day, at Jeddah to take the pilgrims to their homes, and by the end of September all except a few stragglers had gone. When one remembers that more than 20,000 of the pilgrims embarked on these boats, and that the whole were embarked without fuss and without difficulty, except for unavoidable delays due to the local quarantine authorities, it says a good deal to the credit of the Javanese Government, the shipping companies and the local shipping agent.

The shipping arrangements for the Indian pilgrims, on the other hand, were not altogether satisfactory. Here we have two shipping companies competing with each other: the Mogul and Arab steamers, run by Turner, Morrison and Co., of Bombay, and the Shustari Line, run by the Persian Gulf Steam Navigation Company, Bombay. The former carry return ticket holders and the latter single ticket holders. The Mogul Line and Gellatley, Hankey and Co. for the Arab Line. It is when the pilgrims are returning that the evil of this competition becomes apparent, and the consideration of the pilgrims becomes secondary.

Hadji Abdulla Ali Riza, who is the head of the firm of Zeinal Ali Riza, is Kaimakam of Jeddah. He is a man of charming personality and an efficient kaimakam, but there seems no doubt that he abuses his official position for the sake of business. In order to fight the other company the single fare to Bombay was reduced to 17 rupees, and the return fare to 34 rupees. The "Nurani," for all of which Hadji Zeinal Ali Riza is agent, carried 300, 400, 700 and 200 single ticket holders respectively. The majority of the mutawifis send the pilgrims first to the office of Hadji Zeinal Ali Riza, and as many of them cannot read they are unable to say whether the ticket received is for the boat they asked for or for a later boat.

The most glaring case of non-cooperation between the two local agents of Turner, Morrison and Co. occurred when both the "Koweit" and the "Nurani" were booked pilgrims for Bombay. The "Koweit" of which Messrs. Gellatley, Hankey and Co. are the agents, arrived in Jeddah on the 1st August, and the "Nurani" arrived with cargo on the 24th August. The latter was discharged with

Hadji Zeinal Ali Riza and explained that the "Koweit" which carried 400 more pilgrims than the "Nurani," could carry all the "Nurani" pilgrims plus the 300 booked for the "Koweit," and that, as both boats belonged to Turner, Morrison and Co., this should be done. I also wired Turner, Morrison and Co., but the "Nurani" left on the 31st August, seven days after her arrival, and the 300 pilgrims booked for the "Koweit," the majority of whom were return ticket holders, had to wait for the return of the Medina pilgrims. The "Koweit" left on the 1st October after a stay of two months in Jeddah.

The steamship "Sultania," of the Persian Gulf Steam Navigation Company, local agents, Messrs. Khandwani and Co., arrived here on the 18th August, and left on the 31st. She has accommodation for about 1,400 pilgrims, and yet she was only able to book 402.

Another shipping arrangement which was very unpopular with pilgrims, and which caused a great deal of trouble, was the return of the Medina pilgrims from Yembo. There were three ships then in Jeddah harbour: the "Dara," the "Akbar" and the "Jeddah." In this case the agents co-operated, and the "Dara" was sent to bring all the pilgrims. She arrived in Yembo on the 12th October and found there a good many Indian pilgrims waiting for passage. Unfortunately many of the pilgrims were delayed on route the Persians being extremely late in leaving Medina. In the meantime, the steamship "Mansourah" arrived at Yembo from Suez, and about 600 Indian pilgrims booked for the "Dara" returned, and all the pilgrims, about 3,200 in number, came on the "Dara." The pilgrims complained of overcrowding and lack of water but for such a short distance—about eighteen hours sailing—I think the previous complaint can be ruled out.

On two occasions the destination of the Indian boats was changed. The steamship "H. K. W." (agents, Messrs. Gellatley, Hankey and Co.) was originally destined for Bombay, and later changed to Bombay, and the steamship "Homayun" (agents, Messrs. Ali Riza) took her place for the Persian Gulf. The steamship "Jeddah" (agents, Messrs. Hankey and Co.) was also on her second trip destined for the Persian Gulf, and the steamship "Akbar" (agents, Hadji Zeinal Ali Riza) took her place and the "Jeddah" went to Bombay.

The shipping arrangements for the Egyptian pilgrims appear to be inadequate, and necessitate an unnecessary stay of the pilgrims in the quarantine camp at Tor. Only two steamers were used for the pilgrimage, and these did each two journeys to Jeddah and two from Jeddah. On the return journey they put down the first pilgrims at Tor, return to Jeddah for the second batch, and on arrival at Tor take the first pilgrims to Suez. Otherwise, the Egyptian pilgrimage is well organised, and Yousuf Ali Mahmoud Hilmi, the officer sent to arrange the disembarkation and the embarkation of the Egyptian pilgrims, did his work extremely well.

This year we did not interfere with the local quarantine authorities, and the Arab Government in the majority of cases sent the pilgrims to the quarantine islands for twenty-four hours, even though all pilgrim boats arrived from Kamaran with a clean bill of health. The Jeddah quarantine authorities follow no definite rule but disembark at once. The state of the quarantine islands at Jeddah remains the same and no improvements have been made. The pilgrims, for the most part, were sent to Wusta, where there is no disinfecting plant and no proper hospital.

The pilgrims, on return, paid 5 piastres for a medical certificate of health. This was done purely to obtain revenue, as the majority of the pilgrims received the certificate from their mutawwifs and were not medically inspected.

There was the same difficulty this year as last with non-Egyptian pilgrims from the north—Algerians, Tunisians, and Syrians. These all come to the pilgrimage via Egypt, but they are unable to return owing to the edict that non-Egyptian pilgrims on their journey are not allowed to disembark in Egypt. The numbers are so small—only fifty Algerians and Tunisians and 200 Syrians, that the action of the Egyptian Government in every year trying to enforce this rule is difficult to understand. Even after we have obtained permission for them to travel by the

wait for ten days for another boat. The whole passenger traffic to the north from the Arabian coast is stopped, and must strictly obey all regulations.

The Dutch consul left Jeddah by the Khedivial boat of the 1st November, more than two months after the pilgrimage and after Tor had been closed, and he wrote to me as follows:

"I thought it necessary to tell you that the quarantine measures in Suez seem to me to be beyond measure severe. Think, that we arrived the sixth day after our departure from Jeddah. Of course two cases of disease occurred on board but nevertheless all deck passengers from Jeddah because of the mere fact that they were coming from there, were picked out and ordered to go ten days in quarantine at Moses Wells. Among them were some merchants going to Constantinople. They complained to me but, of course, I could not help them. Should there be no way to convince the authorities here to change this method next year?"

This is the opinion shared by everyone in Jeddah. The Arabs ask me why a country in which plague has become endemic, should be so strict about quarantining people from a country free from plague and cholera, and why, if quarantine is an effective safeguard, there should be so much difficulty about allowing non-Egyptian pilgrims to land in Egypt.

The pilgrim ships from the East all called at Kamaran on their way to Jeddah, and there were submitted to the quarantine measures laid down in the convention. It was unfortunate that Kamaran was not open when the first pilgrim boat arrived from the Dutch East Indies, but I am glad to say that arrangements have been made to keep Kamaran open the whole year round, and this will not occur again. Boats returning to India and the Persian Gulf called at Kamaran on their return journey for medical inspection, boats for Singapore and the Dutch East Indies went direct.

5. Indian Pilgrimage Hospital.

Soon after my arrival in Jeddah I wrote to King Hussein asking for his consent to an Indian pilgrimage hospital working at Jeddah.

The hospital arrived in Jeddah in the month of October, 1907. Soon after their arrival King Hussein, who did not wish them to work at Jeddah, sent orders to the hospital authorities to leave Jeddah and to go to Medina. The hospital authorities, however, refused to leave Jeddah, and the King Hussein, who did not wish them to work at Jeddah, sent orders to the hospital authorities to leave Jeddah and to go to Medina.

These orders relaxed occasionally from time to time and the sympathy of all the notables of Jeddah, who realised the futility of the Arab hospital, was with us in the matter.

In spite of all this obstruction the hospital was an unqualified success and a splendid example of efficiency and good organisation.

Their commanding officer, of whose work I cannot speak too highly. All patients, Europeans and pilgrims, were well looked after and well treated.

The work of the hospital is fully described in the report.

As it was impossible to send the hospital or part of the hospital as such to Medina, I told Captain Salamatullah to take on of the hospital equipment and to be ready to cooperate with the Arab authorities in the event of an outbreak of infection.

The pilgrim boat the steamship "Naurang" on the 20th November. When the caravans returned from Medina a large number of destitute pilgrims began to collect in Jeddah so I asked Captain Salamatullah to issue rations to these destitute pilgrims from the hospital rations. This was done most efficiently and rations for 200 pilgrims were issued.

This room is locked and the key kept in the British agency. There is unfortunately no chance that King Hussein will allow the hospital to work next year and it is a debatable point whether it would be better to send the equipment back to India or to keep it in Jeddah for future use.

6. Recommendations.

1. Indian Pilgrimage.

It seems useless to reiterate the necessity for compulsory return tickets for pilgrims. This year we have a larger number of destitute Indian pilgrims. This year we sent back 500 destitute Indian pilgrims at 45 rupees per pilgrim at the expense of the Government of India.

This is not to be wondered at when one knows that in one boat alone nearly 100 sick pilgrims arrived in Jeddah without enough money to pay their boat fare and these pilgrims must have begged their way throughout the pilgrimage and then

The Government of India proposes to deal with the question by the issue of compulsory return tickets, with food, were issued there would be no need to take him back to India, and it would be a simple matter to feed any poor pilgrims.

waiting for a boat. I would suggest, further, that the return tickets be deposited in the hands of the shipping agents, and that the shipping arrangements for returning pilgrims be controlled by the Indian Government. It would mean the

than continue to work with the unsatisfactory conditions which prevail at present. All the pilgrims from the Dutch East Indies and the Malay Peninsula are given return tickets with food, and the result is that there is no destitution, no competition between the shipping companies, and the pilgrimage is becoming each year more popular. I think it is only fair to us, to whom the Arab Government look for the care and protection of Indian pilgrims, that the Indian Government should try this scheme for a period of five years before deciding on the institution of a relief fund. A relief fund could be used in India to enable the poorer pilgrims to do the Hadj in greater comfort, but should not be used in Jeddah for the repatriation of destitute pilgrims.

II - Northern Pilgrimage

Some arrangement must be made to clear up the present state of chaos regarding pilgrims and passengers for the north. Two things should in my opinion, be kept in view:-

- (a) Everything should be done to encourage northern pilgrims to come to the pilgrimage, and all facilities should be made for their transshipment.
- (b) The ordinary passenger traffic from the Hedjaz to Suez and Port Sudan should not be interfered with.

As explained under another heading, the only pilgrim ships from the north are the two Khedivial boats. These are fast, and any other pilgrims must travel on the ordinary Khedivial or Italian boats to Suez. These, so as not to be pilgrim boats, can only carry deck passengers to the number of 1 per cent of their tonnage, and the result is that the pilgrims are crowded on the deck. If the Egyptian Government were to allow pilgrims to disembark in Egypt, then they ought to notify the authorities in Syria, Tunis, and then to leave them stranded in Jeddah.

With the present shipping arrangements, the quarantine at Tor is excessive. A ship can return to Jeddah, embark pilgrims, and then return to Tor. Facilities will be made for the pilgrims.

III - Pilgrims' Hospital

In view of the strong opposition of King Hussein to this hospital, there is no prospect that it will be established. There only remains the British dispensary, now under the charge of Dr. Mourad bin the Indian vice-consul. This is only suitable for the treatment of out patients, and lack of proper hospital accommodations will be greatly missed.

A certain amount of isolation of dysentery bacilli would be a great asset. At present we possess a microscope and sufficient stains for ordinary routine work. What one should keep in view is the establishment of a permanent Indian Moslem hospital in a building in Jeddah, and if prominent Indian Moslems were to bring pressure to bear on King Hussein he might eventually agree. The hospital must be a Moslem hospital, and must have no direct connection with the Indian Government or with the British agency.

IV - British Agency Personnel

I regret to say that the Indian Government proposes recalling to India in March, Inspector Said Hassan. This will be a great loss to us. Inspector Hassan is so well-known all over the

Hedjaz, knows so much about the pilgrimage, and has always done his work so well and efficiently, that I must protest against his withdrawal. The Indian vice-consul's time is fully occupied with medical work, and we require someone to devote all his time to Indian pilgrimage work.

V. Shipping

It would be advisable that some arrangement be come to by the shipping agents, so that as far as possible pilgrims are sent back in the order of their arrival in Jeddah after the Hadj. Failing this, an official sent by the Indian Government to arrange the embarkation of the Indian pilgrims, as is done by the Egyptian Government, appears to be the best solution. If return tickets are made compulsory, and these are deposited in the British agency, it would be a simple matter, with the co-operation of the shipping agents, to detail the pilgrims for the steamers as they collect their tickets.

In conclusion I beg to draw attention to the excellent work of the staff of the Hospital. Of the former Mr J. F. Borradell who acted as pro-consul during the absence on leave of the British consul Mr D. Lambie, and Inspector Said Hassan deserve particular mention for the high standard of their work. Captain Salamatullah M.C. I.M.S., the officer commanding the Indian Pilgrimage Hospital, did most excellent work and is worthy of the highest praise. He is an excellently run, and I think his choice as officer in command of the hospital was most appropriate. All his staff worked well, and I was particularly impressed by the excellent work of sub-assistant surgeon S. E. Parani.

I also wish to express our thanks to Mr. Khandwani, the local agent for the Persian Gulf Steam Navigation Company, and Mr. Namazi, of Bombay, for carrying a certain number of destitute Indian pilgrims free of charge.

Enclosure 2 in No. 174

Report by Captain M. Salamatullah

IN consultation with the Secretaries of State, the Government of India decided to despatch personnel and supplementary equipment to reopen the hospital for pilgrims sent to Jeddah last year. I was detailed for command of the hospital and was ordered to report to the surgeon general, Bombay. I accordingly arrived in Poona on the 11th April, and received orders to recruit the staff. Owing to financial stringency, the strength of the personnel was reduced to about one third of the last year, thus the staff comprised one I.M.S. officer, two senior assistant surgeons, and forty three other ranks. No lady doctor was procurable at the pay sanctioned. Sufficient time was spent on the recruitment and, as was emphasised by the Government, no pains were spared to secure the right type of men only. This preliminary labour afterwards proved to be of immense value to me, and was a great asset in the smooth and successful running of the hospital.

As regards rations and additional medical stores, I made arrangements that they should all accompany the hospital, instead of following it as they did last year. In this I was successful.

Having made all preparations, the hospital started from Poona on the 18th May and sailed the next day on the steamship "Jeddah".

early to get established and be ready to afford comfort and cure to the sick and needy. Jeddah is a small seaport with a population of about 25,000. It has a few houses inside the city wall, the only buildings outside being the headquarters of the Arab army and four Turkish barracks.

The hospital was accommodated in the middle two of these barracks just as was done last year. We set to work to establish the hospital as early as possible, and within two days of our landing the first indoor patient was admitted. Most of the equipment was lying in the British agency, and part of it was shifted to

the hospital premises. There was found to be no list of the equipment. As a matter of fact, last year the equipment was sent by instalments, some of it arrived in Jeddah, some in Medina, and some in Mecca. Hence there was no responsible person on the spot to take charge and make a list of the stuff that arrived.

There was plenty of open space by the side of the hospital buildings and in this the outdoor department was opened under canvas. The camp was nicely laid down, and the beautifully arranged tentage elicited praise from the visitors and people of Jeddah.

The institution soon began to be popular and within a few weeks we were attracting patients from distant places in the Hedjaz. At this time there were five other hospitals in Jeddah—three belonged to the different consulates, the British, Dutch and Italian, and two to the Arabs. All these medical institutions were of old standing, and were conveniently situated, some being right in the middle of the town, while we were located about a mile from the heart of the city and separated from it by a sandy tract without road or trees. Comparisons are always odious, but all the same, I am proud to say that our hospital, with all the advantages, soon superseded other medical institutions. It was very gratifying to see old men and women and children flocking to the hospital every morning. Some on camels, others on donkeys, and the rest tottering on their legs, in the hot July sun, came in quest of cure and treatment. Within a month of our arrival in Jeddah the hospital was in full swing, and the daily outdoor number had gone up to 280. This may be regarded as an achievement in a country like the Hedjaz where the people have not as yet realised the value of European medicine. The total number of outdoor patients treated was 8,365. The hospital was open day and night, and although the other hospitals closed on Fridays, we did not observe even a partial holiday on Sundays.

The growing popularity of the hospital made the Arab authorities envious.

Within a few yards from ours, in the next Turkish building, His Majesty the King came over in person to honour the opening ceremony, after which he sent for me and assured me of his good wishes for our hospital. He said that we were all brethren, and hence there could be no question of an Arab and an Indian hospital, and as we were all striving for the same aim and object, there could be no rivalry between the two institutions. We must all work for the amelioration of the afflicted and ailing.

But this Arab hospital was never equipped, and not a drop of medicine was supplied for the use of patients. The only day that a physician came there was on the day of the opening ceremony, and the only patient treated therein was this physician himself, who got the medicines from our hospital.

The next step the Arabs took was to ask for the transfer of Arab patients from our hospital. According to orders, I handed over two Arab patients to the party which came to receive them, but both the patients refused to leave the comfort of our hospital. They were however forcibly removed.

And no pilgrims were left in Jeddah. On the 7th August the Mahomedan personnel also left for Mecca with necessary medical and specially cholera equipment. The Hindu staff, however, carried on the indoor department of the hospital in Jeddah.

The Hadj

After staying in Mecca for two days, I took the party to Arafat—the place where the Mahomedans perform the Hadj. There is no manner of shelter, and there are no houses or huts. On the 10th of Zul Hadj (lunar month of the Mahomedans) it suddenly springs into a city of canvas. The heat in this plain is intense, and sunstroke takes a heavy toll from the pilgrims. Last year, in the space of a few hours, 500 lives were lost on this altar. Luckily, however, this year the weather was excellent and the maximum temperature under shade did not exceed 107° F. There were, therefore, practically no deaths this year.

The water supply of Arafat is from an aqueduct called Nahal-i Zubeda. It is closed, but has wide windows and apertures for the outlet of water. Men are jumping into these openings for a bath and swim, the women are noticed to be washing their faces, while the camels and donkeys drink from the same source and

the waste water all returns to the canal. It is difficult to imagine circumstances more favourable for the propagation of any water-borne disease, such as dysentery and diarrhoea, &c.

From Arafat the party returned to Muna via Muzalifah. Here one has to stay for three days. There are plenty of houses, but the bulk of the pilgrims live in tents. The chief thing done is the sacrifice of animals to commemorate the willingly proffered sacrifice of his son by Abraham. Thousands upon thousands of camels and sheep are sacrificed here every year, but yet there is no organisation of any kind. If the hides of these animals are kept intact it can be a source of great financial help to the country.

The offals of these animals are scattered all over, and there is no satisfactory latrine arrangements. The whole camp is strewn with night soil and refuse. Flies, of course, abound, and the stink is unbearable. A D.A.D.M.S. (sanitation) would not have an enviable job here. It is surprising how in these ideal circumstances an epidemic does not break out every year. This could be attributed only to the powerful rays of the tropical sun, which is providential in killing disease germs.

This year there have been some attempts at scavenging, and some carts were sent to collect the refuse. There was a nice cool breeze on the first two days, but on the last day the temperature suddenly went up to 115° F., and there were some deaths, but nothing compared to the last year.

I distributed the medicines which I had taken with me, and the hospital party was able to meet the emergency more tents were pitched and the accommodation increased.

At first there were plenty of boats standing in the harbour, so the pilgrims were able to travel in Jeddah, but in the beginning of September, owing to the upsetting of shipping arrangements, many pilgrims were stranded and rendered destitute. Hence the hospital, under orders of the British agent, took upon itself the responsibility of feeding these unfortunate pilgrims. Dry rations were issued daily, first to the stranded pilgrims, and then to the pilgrims who had arrived after a caravan from Medina had arrived, the daily number rose to 420. The plight of these destitutes could better be imagined than described. They were all in rags, and their faces told the tale of starvation and privation. The only ray of hope came from the British agent, who gave them easy access to the agency. Major Marshall was all sympathy for these unfortunate ones and did his best to alleviate their sufferings and hardships.

The hospital continued to feed the destitutes from the 6th September to the 10th October. The steamship "Jeddah" arrived on the 10th, and the hospital supplies, but the pilgrims (destitute) on board. I arranged with the captain to supplement my rations, and so we were able to feed them till the day of landing in Bombay. The service which the hospital performed is worthy of note.

The work of the hospital was carried on, specially in the indoor department. Two hundred patients of different nationalities were treated, as is shown in the accompanying table.

The chief diseases treated in the indoor were malaria, dysentery and surgical ailments. The in-patients belonged to all grades of society. Not only naval and air force officers were treated, but one English lady was admitted, and they all testified to the high standard of comfort and efficiency that obtained in the hospital. Later on the hospital had the privilege of the stay of one Indian knight for about a fortnight.

The results of the treatment of in-patients were very encouraging—death

In the out-door 8,365 patients were treated as compared to 1,025 last year. The chief diseases treated were malaria, dysentery and diarrhoea. By far the greater number of out-patients were

I am gratified to say that the hospital did valuable surgical work. The people

established a reputation which could favourably be compared to the position and prestige that an English hospital holds in this part of the world. Including minor

the bladder in the Hedjaz, and as we had no instruments for lithotripsy, supra pubic operations were done in all cases, and the result was gratifying. One man of the late ruling family of Mecca (descendant of an earlier Sherreef of Mecca) was treated on a few days before our departure from the Hedjaz, and as this proved in Mecca nearly two score of patients (stone and) in the hospital, but they were too late

12th October Captain Pinder, in charge of the British agency dispensary, proceeded to England for demobilisation and from that date until the departure of the hospital from the Hedjaz we carried on the work of the British agency dispensary as well

In the to Mecca

are unqualified, one of them Even in my short stay of five days in Medina

riding camel could allow, these I distributed. Some of them wanted surgical help.

dispensary in charge of a qualified medical man could do immense good to the suffering humanity in the Northern Hedjaz

I must now refer in passing to the finances of the hospital. I have already explained the reasons of increased expenditure. The life of the hospital was prolonged from six to about eight months. In addition the hospital supplied rations to several hundred paupers for several weeks. Apart from this it must be remembered that the Hedjaz is a very expensive place, not only is everything imported, but even water is not a free gift of God. We must thank the Sherreefian Government for the supply of water worth about 4,000 rupees.

Nor was the lighter side of life neglected. The men were encouraged to have sports and football. This afforded recreation to the men in the evening and they took a keen interest in it. Occasionally matches and tournaments were held. One football match was played against a team raised by the British agency, and was attended by the Emir Zeid, youngest son of the Sherreef, and a few of the local

invited. The King sent his hand, and Major Marshall gave away the prizes. These sports had a good moral effect on the Hedjazis, and indicated the supremacy of the physique of even down-country Indians over the native Arabs.

Speaking once more of the popularity of our hospital, I may say that although the Hashemite Government did not recognise our hospital, yet it is a fact that both the officers and men of the Arab army and police frequented the hospital. Even the Ministers of the King availed of our medicines, and both the Military and Civil Governors of Jeddah freely used our hospital.

The discipline maintained in the hospital was of high efficiency. Though the hospital stayed in Arabia for five months and a half, not a single outward accident

necessary to administer a single day's imprisonment to any Indian. In fact a healthy spirit prevailed which showed itself in the way of concerts and musical entertain-

even females dined from one kitchen without any friction.

By the middle of November most of the pilgrims had left. The last caravan had returned from Medina, and the people who stay in Mecca for Muharrum and Mifad-

ud Nabi (Prophet's birthday) had collected in Jeddah. Some 200 destitute Persians and Hadramautes were also present. Thus the hospital left with them in the last pilgrim ship—steamship Nairung—on the 29th November. Almost all the remnants of pilgrims were repatriated by this boat.

offer any suggestions I may have as regards the improvement of the medical arrangements in the Hedjaz.

Pilgrim Ships

The shipping arrangements stand in need of great improvement. The Hajj now falls in the month of August, and the pilgrims have to travel during the hot weather, made worse by the onset of the monsoon. There is no ice or cold drink to had by the ordinary pilgrims even on payment. The quantity of ice (4 to 6 tons) carried by these boats is very limited. It would be a great help if arrangements could be made to store more ice and to sell it to the pilgrims. The quantity of water sanctioned in the Pilgrims' Ships' Act is 1 gallon per head. In some ships it is

I am fully alive to the limited water-carrying capacity of some of these boats, but I should recommend that in the hot months, especially in the fasting month of Ramadan, at least 1½ gallons of water be sanctioned.

As regards the medical arrangements on these boats, I fully concur with the following remarks of my predecessor, Captain Ahmed—

The arrangements for treating the sick Hadjis on board are not very satisfactory. The patients who are admitted into ships' hospitals do not get proper food.

Rules 56 and 57 under the Pilgrims' Ships' Act lay down the supply of medical stores and surgical appliances to be provided, but the list requires revision. I have seen the letter No. 308 from the port health officer, Bombay, to the surgeon-general. I agree with the former that the quantity of medical comforts is sufficient, but the same could not be said of drugs and surgical appliances. I have worked as a medical officer on one of these boats, and I had to supplement the drugs from my own stores.

There is no arrangement to supply ordinary diet to sick pilgrims, and in some there are no latrines provided in the ship's hospital.

Although the Pilgrims' Ships' Act distinctly lays down separate sets of latrines for males and females, I have seen first class ladies and gentlemen using the same latrine. The quantity of disinfectant is also sparingly used.

As regards shipping arrangements in Jeddah, I would suggest that shipping control should be vested in the British agent. He should be empowered to advise and control the movements of the boats.

Suggestions as regards Medical Arrangements in the Hedjaz

In the present state of affairs in the Hedjaz an Indian hospital is not tolerated by the Arab Government, and unless our policy changes it is no use forcing a hospital

form an important foreign element in the country. The Arab hospitals are not worth the name, and according to their own saying, it is as well for a patient who goes to the Arab hospital to go to the Arab cemetery. At present there is not a single

hospital buildings with a few drugs in them. Even a medicine like Epsom salts and calomel are not to be found there.

In the light of these things, what is there to protect our subjects in any epidemic? I am of the opinion that the dispensary attached to the British agency

room and a small laboratory. The importance of Jeddah has greatly increased since the war, this is also indicated by the fact that we keep an agency there instead

as had been done in places like Hodeida. This is all the more important during the pilgrim season.

Before the war doctors of different nationalities used to accompany the pilgrims.

Egyptians, Persians and Japanese doctors generally. This may not be allowed by the British agent, Major Marshall. I am highly indebted to his indefatigable and enthusiastic help, and his skilful guidance. His sympathetic and courteous to work under him.

My proposal of having an I.M.S. officer and to enlarge the British agency in Jeddah would not be objected to, even by the present authorities of the hospital, specially are worthy of note and acknowledgment.

One could not conclude this report without a personal note of grateful acknowledgment of the hospital. Without their willing co-operation and untiring zeal it would have been impossible for the hospital to achieve the success it did. The services of the superior staff generally, and Sub-Assistant Surgeon S. E. Puram, sub-charge of the hospital, specially are worthy of note and acknowledgment.

M. SALAMATULLAH, Captain, I.M.S.,
Officer Commanding Indian Pilgrims.

Jeddah, November 24, 1921.

INDOOR and OUTDOOR Patients Treated in the Hospital

Outdoor Patients	Percentage of Total in the Indoor
1,025	36 per cent.

NATIONALITIES of INDOOR Patients

Nationality	Number of Patients Treated
1 Indian	142
2 Arab	1
3 Bakhari	1
4 British	1
5 Armenian	1
6 African	1
7 Senegal	1
8 Greek	1
9 Egyptian	1
Total	200

M. SALAMATULLAH, Captain, I.M.S.

Enclosure 3 in No. 14

Indian Health Officer, Jeddah, to the British Agent, Jeddah

Sir,
Jeddah, December 18, 1921.
I BEG to put up the following report on Medina for your perusal —

Population.

The present population of Medina is estimated to be between 9,000 and 10,000. The population of Medina now

Sanitation (A)

Inside the city walls the roads were fairly clean. There are no dustbins or urinals in the city, and thus filth is sometimes seen lying on the roads and people are seen making water and even easing themselves with impunity.

Outside the city walls it was all filth, and full carcasses of camels, donkeys and other animals were seen lying rotting and stinking bad. Rubbish carts from inside are taken out and emptied just under the walls.

Sanitation (B)

There has been no epidemic in Medina for some time. There are two hospitals in the city, one is called the civil and the other the military hospital. Both of these hospitals are practically devoid of any medicines, and thus are of no use to the residents. The people for their every day necessities very badly require medical aid. Any medical man found amongst the pilgrims is harassed by the people to prescribe for them and give them any medicine he has got with him.

There are two sections of this force

They are mostly trained for orderly duties. Those of the Haram are meant to keep peace within the Haram, and to disallow begging there, but they themselves are not slow in begging from the pilgrims. Most of the Haram police are from the Takrami tribe.

Army.

The present strength is about 200 men and officers. The rest of the army has been brought to Mecca by Emir Ali. These people also do not get their pay regularly, and there have been instances in which they have looted shops in the city. I have never seen such shabbily dressed officers and men as at Medina.

Present Form of Government, Officers and their Sphere of Action.

The present form of government is that there is an acting Emir, El Saad, in place of his Highness Emir Ali, and he is supposed to be the next to the Emir, but seems to be independent of him, as he does whatever he likes, sometimes even against the orders of the Emir. The third authority to be obeyed is the officer commanding the garrison, and he works quite independent of the other two. Thus there is no consolidated Government and the people do not know whom to obey and whom not. There have been cases when a person had been sent to jail by one officer and set free by the other without any reference to the former.

The Holy Haram

The Holy Haram is the most sacred place in Medina. It is the place where the Prophet Muhammad (P.B.U.) is buried. The Haram is surrounded by a high wall, and the entrance is through a gate. The Haram is the most important place in Medina, and it is the place where the pilgrims come to perform their duties. The Haram is the most sacred place in Medina, and it is the place where the Prophet Muhammad (P.B.U.) is buried. The Haram is surrounded by a high wall, and the entrance is through a gate. The Haram is the most important place in Medina, and it is the place where the pilgrims come to perform their duties.

Financial State of the Residents

The residents, with a few exceptions, are all without sufficient money to keep themselves. The majority are reduced to begging, and one cannot say whether a

gaily dressed person he meets in the streets is a beggar or not, because persons whom I saw were keeping shops, but they are almost empty of merchandise. The necessities of life are at very high prices.

Persons who are in a better position are keeping themselves on highly-reduced rations as best as they could on the lowest possible scale of expense.

Before the war, I am told, was near 100,000 souls, including women and children, in a very poor state. Some have got petty shops, others are living on the charity of others or on petty jobs. When the residents of Medina were turned out by Fakhri during the war and sent to Syria and other northern countries they suffered a lot, and the same was the case with the Indians. Many lives were lost and those that survived were mostly repatriated to India by the British Government, and so only a few have come back to Medina or Mecca.

Political State in General

The people of Medina do not seem to be very keen about politics at the present time. They are united for communication but, as a whole, they consider the 'Nabha' detrimental to their interests. The reason, as far as I could find out, is that the residents had been getting handsome sums of money from the Turks as pay or in the shape of charity, the merchants were well supplied with merchandise, and everything was going on well; therefore, the people were happy and were passing a happy life without any anxiety or difficulties. After the 'Nabha', all sorts of troubles came from the Turks.

None of the Turks would not let the people of Medina care more for money than for anything else. At present, they are not so well off as they were in the past, they are not so well off as they were in the past, they are not so well off as they were in the past.

While I was talking to a gentleman he said that "he who marries the mother over the needs of the children and treat them with fatherly affection, otherwise he should expect no love from the children." The gentleman was of opinion that independence is only good for countries which are self-supporting. As regards

it self-supporting which, he said, could not be done without foreign help for some time. He said that the present attitude of the Government was such that it would hinder the progress of the country for an unlimited time, because all sorts of foreign help is denied and no foreigners are allowed to improve the country. He was, of course, averse to non-Muslims entering into the holy cities of Mecca and Medina.

He said that it is no use driving that the Hashimite Government is not subsidised by the British now that the whole world knows of it, and it is for the improving the country instead of vainly trying to make the world believe that the Hashimite Government can stand on its own feet without foreign support and is quite independent.

Public Safety in and Outside the City

The gates of the city are closed and the doors of the houses are securely shut. Few people attend the markets and the city presents a deserted aspect. There have been no robberies. The people set to watch have themselves not been slow to take the advantage of the situation.

A Indian merchant who has been living in Medina for a long time was attacked by a band of thieves and his goods were stolen.

belongings were also taken away by the thieves, but the police have never been able to find out the culprits. I was informed that solitary persons found in the streets are sometimes relieved of their cash if they happen to have any at the time.

Public safety outside the city can be well imagined. People cannot go out in daytime, not to mention their going out at night. The police and the army are considered to be quite powerless to deal with the robbers who are always lurking about the city walls, especially when the pilgrims are there. Pilgrims could not visit the tomb of Syedna Hamza, which is about 2 miles outside the city and those who had had the courage to go out were robbed or at least clubbed by Bedouins for daring to come out. None of the pilgrims could dare to go to the tomb which is also about 2 miles from the city as the way is zig-zag and passes through date-palm groves and is, therefore, considered to be more dangerous than the one leading to Syedna Hamza.

The Turks had constructed a wide and straight road to 'Kaba' by cutting down trees and clearing the jungle, but it has now been discontinued as the Bedouins have blocked it in several places by erecting stone walls or digging deep ditches in the middle of the road. If this road was in order the pilgrims could be easily watched by two sentries, one at the Kaba Gate, Medina, and the other at 'Kaba' itself.

Railway

The railway station at Medina is an incomplete stone building and it appears that something grand was anticipated to be erected. It seems to be empty now as I did not see anyone there and the building is also in a neglected condition.

I saw four quite big engines, three on the rails and one off the rails. It appears they are not looked after by anybody, because they are very dirty and showed signs that they have not been used for some time. They look very powerful machines. I also saw some passenger cars and goods waggons, but they too were in a very neglected condition. I had the opportunity of seeing the railway line up to a distance of about 10 miles, but it was in a very poor condition. A small sum of money and the services of a few men who know the art are required to bring the line in a working condition.

Agriculture

From the vegetation and date palm groves outside the city it appears that the land is arable. In former times, I am told, a good crop of wheat and other food stuffs used to be harvested. People went on leaving agriculture, and now only a few things are grown. The Turks, I consider, are to be blamed for this because they never did anything for the improvement of the country. A plenty of water for agriculture can be procured.

Some experimental farms are made by the Government and agriculture encouraged the people may also become cultivators, and thus the needs of the city would be supplied to some extent.

Pilgrims, and how they are dealt with

On arrival at Medina the pilgrims are not free to choose their own muzawwir as they can do regarding their mutawwif at Mecca. The districts of India have been distributed amongst the muzawwirs, and pilgrims coming from those districts have to go to these muzawwirs and leave the company of their other friends with whom they have been travelling. Sometimes a servant, who happens to be the resident of a district other than the master, has to go to another muzawwir and the master to another. In such cases the pilgrims have to reconcile the muzawwirs by paying something, to let the master and the servant come together. The muzawwirs at Medina are not so impolite and strict as are the mutawwifs at Mecca otherwise great difficulties would have arisen. The Japanese pilgrims have no fixed muzawwirs and so it is at the option of their mutawwif (travelling with the pilgrims) to whom they will go. The mutawwif usually takes his party to the muzawwir who will charge him the least and give him and his party full comfort. The fees for the muzawwirs are not fixed as they are at Mecca and therefore it rests with the pilgrims how much they pay. Owing to this the muzawwirs try to make as much money as they can from the pilgrims in whatever way possible. Generally the pilgrims are not allowed to stay in Medina for more than three days. All complaints made by the pilgrims against the camel men of their maltreatment on the way are not heard by the authorities at Medina, and the camel-men are given full liberty to do with the

pilgrims as they like. This year the pilgrims who visited Medina after the Hadj were put to great troubles especially the Persians. They were made to stay in Medina for a very long time as the camel-men were not willing to bring them back unless the pilgrims have paid money demanded by the Bedouins and the camel-men and were then taken to Yembo instead of being brought to Jeddah as was agreed upon at the time of their departure from Mecca, and for which the pilgrims had already paid.

Yembo-Medina Road

The Yembo-Medina road is not safe, and the pilgrim caravans which visited Medina before the Hadj had to go from Mecca or Jeddah and come back to Mecca by land. The last pilgrim caravan, after the Hadj, had to come back to Jeddah via Yembo. The pilgrims took as long as ten days to reach Yembo, which is considered to be only five days' journey from Medina and were put to great troubles by the Bedouins on the way. The Persian pilgrims suffered the most. They were the last to leave Medina and were stopped at every 3 or 4 miles and made to pay money to the Bedouins.

The Hamda tribe is considered to be the most troublesome tribe, and it is rumored that this tribe is quite fearless of the Government, and the people do whatever they like. It is almost impossible for any caravan, whether of pilgrims or of merchandise, to pass by this tribe without paying something. The chief place of the Hamda tribe is at Yembo, and thus the caravans travelling on this road have to pass this nest of the thieves. The rendezvous is a little farther up, where the road is narrower with hills on both sides and this gives a very good chance to the Hamdas to stop caravans.

The other route via Jeddah is infested by the Jahena tribe, and is considered to be more dangerous and thus not used for any kind of traffic at all.

I beg &c

H. SAID HANAN

Indian Police Officer

E 1171 248 91

No. 175.

Acting Consul Graffley Smith to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received February 1.)

No. 91

Telegram

Jeddah, February 1, 1922

Y.O. B telegram No. 1.

I have talked to King Hussein as instructed.

His lengthy reply is being sent by bag to-day. He declares that he will not

boundaries and authority. Reply covers copy of letter addressed to Prime Minister, dated 30th December last, resuming his old grievances and pressing for sympathetic treatment on lines of his correspondence with Mr. Mahon. This was evidently to be the basis of discussion.

King Hussein adds that unless he receives answer "Yes" or "No" to these claims by 25th February he will abdicate.

E 1378 668 91

No. 176

Acting Consul Graffley Smith to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. — (Received February 7)

No. 7 Secret

By L. 10.

Jeddah, January 21, 1922

I HAVE the honour to transmit to you herewith the Jeddah report for the period the 1st-20th January, 1922.

(Copies of this report and despatch have been sent to Cairo, Bagdad, Jerusalem, Aden and Delhi.)

I have &c

B. GRAFFLEY SMITH

Enclosure 1 in No. 176.

(Secret.)

Jeddah Report, January 1-20, 1922

List of King Hussein to Jeddah.

A. N. HUSSEIN arrived from Mecca on the 8th January accompanied by the Emir / his visit was his desire to inspect the Wazirah aqueduct, damaged by the November storm. He did, in fact, drive out there during the afternoon of the 8th and 9th any question of the Jeddah water supply. His Majesty came to Jeddah

There was a strong rumor that a 25 per cent. levy on capital was in prospect, and elsewhere. Their fears, rendered more acute by the consideration that, if and when capital, did not, however, in this instance materialize. The King was content to referred to in my last report, and to ensure a general increase in revenue by the imposition of new taxation.

Industrial Enterprise Company

For each share in the company 50 gold was charged. The stocks of the different guilds were summoned and asked how many shares the individual merchants, auctioneers, &c., under their authority could afford to take up. Scrip (a bare receipt) was allotted accordingly. The company have issued no prospectus and, naturally, have fixed no rate of interest. The money is supposed to be earmarked for the purchase and upkeep of two steamers. Someone expressed alarm lest these vessels might be run by the Government and, but the King reassured him, on the ground that, as the Government were acquiring two other steamers of their own, there would be no temptation to them to act thus.

I have not heard that definite steps have yet been taken for the purchase of this nucleus merchant marine, the idea of which was, as recently reported, suggested to K. H. by George Lotfallah. It is said that the latter is negotiating for in Egypt, while I know that a local (Indian) engineer has been instructed by the kaimakam to suggest means for dry-docking in Jeddah. The venture can have company have at last decided to detach a steamer, the steamship "Bornlos," for general coastal trade in the Red Sea.

New Taxation.

The new taxes imposed by the King are likely to prove remunerative. These

turkish piastres tax on every package be it merchandise or personal luggage, having mentioned in my last report, is supplementary to customs dues. The health certificate, with which every sea-going traveller from Jeddah has now to be provided, has been raised from 5 to 20 Turkish piastres (plus 1 Turkish piastre stamp). For each camel plying between Jeddah and Mecca a tax of 20 Turkish piastres (plus 1 Turkish piastre stamp) is collected in respect of each (single) journey. This tax has been raised from 5 Turkish piastres. In Mecca, 20 Turkish piastres per corpse buried is levied as a burial charge or reservoir in the foundations, for water storage. Persons filling these with water bought and brought from wells outside the town—the only available source of supply—are mulcted of 200 or 400 Turkish piastres, according to the size of the reservoir, by a Government not ashamed to exploit the very necessities of life.

On K interest on the King's part in the present conditional offer of a subsidy. The King

* Not printed.

Two Farmsteads (fixed Fiat motor of 100 h.p.), both unpacked, but unassembled.
One Caudron, useless.

Two Caudrons (Bon motor, 120 h.p.), one in good condition, the other under repair.

The efforts of the whole force are at present directed towards getting the de Havilland to Taif for bombing operations against Kiekh and Taraba.

The personnel in Taif consists of an Italian mechanic named Delicuta and a Greek pilot, holding British certificates, named Stavria. The latter, who arrived from Egypt on the 5th instant, flew a Caudron from Jeddah to Taif without mishap on the 18th instant. He differs from the Russian pilots in Jeddah in that he considers himself engaged for military as well as civil flying, and it is he who will be detailed to bomb Taraba when, if ever, the de Havilland machine reaches Taif. The Caudrons now in Taif cannot remain up long enough for an operation against Taraba. The new aerodrome at Taif is 900 yards long and from 100 to 200 yards wide. Entry can only be made with a north or south wind, that is, not after about 4 P.M., when the wind veers to the west.

The personnel in Jeddah has been increased by the arrival of five Russian refugees from Egypt on the 5th January. Of these, two are mechanics, and the remainder pilots. Of Messrs. Jungmeister, Minchaok and Komnietzof, the pilots, the first is an ex-colonel in the Tsarist army. He has made one small flight round the Jeddah aerodrome, and is now suffering from a diplomatic malady likely to last until one of his compatriots puts the de Havilland out of action.

The second endeavor was to fly when King Hussein inspected the aerodrome on the 10th January, but, having got the machine 5 yards up, he crashed at His Majesty's feet.

He King left the room without comment.

M. Kouznetsov has proved unable to fly any machine as yet, and he now assures the local authorities that he is a sea-plane expert, and cannot be expected to fly on land.

The new mechanics are named Agunief and Sologuons.

All the Rumanians have applied to me for British protection during their stay in the Hedjaz. Unless they manifest more competence than has yet been visible, their stay is likely to be a short one.

Stelagromys

with His Majesty. I pressed for an early decision. The King makes a show of dallying with the idea of a 14. sterling tax per head, but only to dismiss it, on the ground that the duties which pilgrims would have a right to expect, are actually in being. The first pilgrim ships from the Netherlands have been warned not to call at Zanzibar. The collection of the 1923 dues. They will presumably collect from the pilgrims. I have just received a letter from the Director-General of Quarantine, pointing out the difficulties between shipping agents and the Director-General of Quarantine. This is much to be deplored, but it is probably what the King desires. He welcomes every occasion for which he can intervene on these lines, his four months' procrastination is explained.

His accounts are at present under investigation, and they alone should hang him. His friends, however, are doing their best to save him. The Yami, leads the pack against him, and I believe the kamukam, the Director-General of Customs and the Rai-ul-Baladiah to be united in working for his downfall. If he goes, quarantine affairs may be better than they were last year. They cannot fall into worse hands.

Whatever may be the quarantine does finally fixed, pilgrims this year must be prepared for most extreme heat & few articles which will be of use and in the pilgrimage season. It is estimated that this & Turkish pilgrims per passage

[0975]

312

establishment of Wahhabi contact with El Wejh. The Juhama and Bilh tribes are friendly to Wahhabi propaganda. Ali will however have no lack of enemies. Ahmed-ben Masmar, leader of the anti-Mecca party at Matnakam, openly declares himself as leader of the anti-Mecca party. Misfactors imprisoned by order of the acting governor. Ahmed-ben Masmar, are released by order

The present distribution of the Hashemite air forces is :—

Two Armstrongs / Beardmore motors of 160 h.p.) not yet unpacked.

In this condition, the other lacks essential parts. None of the pilots locally available are familiar with this type of machine.

The Emir also informed me that His Majesty personally favoured the idea of a line, rather than a railway between the port and the capital.

Pres. J. A. C. 1864

No. 548 contains an official proclamation protesting against the Government of Medina have appropriated the Moorish waqfs there.
No. 549 publishes the scale of stamp taxes on commercial and other documents.
These papers contain nothing else of interest.

Enclosure 2 to No. 170

Shipping Intelligence to January 31, 1922

The following steamers arrived at and departed from Jeddah between December 31, 1921, and January 31, 1922:—

[Faint, illegible handwritten notes]

Omitted from previous Return.

MAY 1954 • 519 • [Vol. 94]

E 1974 248 917

No. 177

Living Consul Geoffrey-Smith to the Marquesas Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received February 21.)

King Hussein asked me to remind you of his desire to abdicate as soon as possible. He is asking me to ask you to take note formally of his abdication. The conditions in the country are very bad, and I think King is fairly desperate.

deprecate reply, merely confirming him in this belief without backing of material concerns.

If he is not pressed for reconsideration of decision, three things are possible. He may say no more about abducting and carry on as at present, more antagonistic and more desperate than ever. He may announce abdication publicly and still remain in Mexico. All eyes will be on him. He may announce abdication and accept assignment to a post in the U.S. Many of these latter are possible.

I should be grateful for very early intimation of lines on which His Majesty's

The Government have sent me to me and return a letter addressed to the King of Meccah, dated May 1, 1916, from the Amir of Meccah, Muhammad bin Sawwah and Abdullah bin-Sulayr, reporting Wahhabi activity in Jeddah and the surrounding area. The letter is in Arabic and is so obscure that I have been unable to estimate its value as intelligence or, indeed, to

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Acting Consul Graffley-Smith (Jeddah)

(No. 6.)

(Telegraphic.) R.

Foreign Office, February 21, 1922

YOUR telegram No. 9 of 1st February and other telegrams regarding Hussein's threatened resignation.

You should inform King Hussein that note has been taken of his decision to resign on 27th February, and add that His Majesty's Government, mindful of his loyal co-operation during the war and of their cordial relations with His Majesty during the last six years, regret that he should find it necessary to take this step, but realise that it is a matter which King Hussein must settle with his own people. (End of R.)

(Confidential.)

If Hussein should in fact abdicate, it is desirable that Ali should accede to the throne forthwith. Should this take place, you can assure him of the friendly feelings which His Majesty's Government entertain for him.

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Acting Consul Graffley-Smith (Jeddah)

(No. 7.)

(Telegraphic.)

Foreign Office, February 22, 1922

YOUR telegram No. 10 of 20th February, Hussein's abdication.

I incline to the view that, if Hussein abdicates, it would be better that he should stay on at Mecca, where he cannot give much trouble if Ali succeeds him. Our intervention in any way, such as facilities for voyage to and stay in Egypt, would probably be exaggerated and misinterpreted. What precise disasters do you foresee from his staying in Mecca?

(Repealed to Cairo, No. 59.)

Acting Consul Graffley-Smith to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received February 28)

No. 12. Secret.)

My Lord,

Jeddah, February 10, 1922

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith the Jeddah report for the period from the 21st January to the 10th February, 1922.

The report is a report of the events which have taken place in the region of Jerusalem, Aden and Doha.

I have, &c

L. B. GRAFFLEY SMITH

Acting British Agent.

Enclosure 1 in No. 180

Jeddah Report for the Period January 21–February 10, 1922.

(Secret)

FUEL has been added to the fire of King Hussein's ever-growing resentment at the ungenerous treatment he considers himself to have received at British hands by the articles appearing in the "Times" of the 27th–30th December last, and by the recent message that the Emir Abdullah's visit to London is to be made conditional upon the King's ratification of the document signed at Amman.

The present state of affairs has not been helped by the fact that the British Government has been a hard master to the King in any particular criticism in the press. The latter affords him a welcome opportunity to state his case,

nominal against the "Times," but actually against Great Britain, in successive numbers of "Al Qibla." Thus he does at great length, with apposite reproduction of official correspondence—communications from the High Commissioner, Cairo, and from His Majesty's Government—addressed to him through this agency in 1918; his comments thereon, pungent in the light of post bellum developments, reach a degree against which I have felt compelled to register a strong protest. He has not scrupled to be one of his own unacceptable drafts of the treaty, where his argument was thereby served.

This article has at once been seized upon by "Al Omrah," of Cairo, as evidence of the purpose of its publication, it has been ranged back, in its evocation of criticism of his self-confessed betrayal of the best interests of Islam.

The convention so often reiterated that King Hussein

"Al Qibla"

Jeddah" is in correspondence it has been in the past with the

In a letter dated the 2nd January

intention of abdicating on the last

him before then. His voluntary

of events, and hypothetical conjecture as to

a card which previous experience leads him

force of troops, and until he is convinced of this conviction he will

at the British Empire exists by his favour, and that he really is

the novel of the universe. Some thought of the strong position that would be his as

the result of an act of abdication which left him as a distinguished resident in Mecca

may, however, have occurred to him.

While the formulae of gratitude and of attachment to Great Britain continue to

grace the King's correspondence, the action of the Hashimite Government officials,

always dictated personally over the royal telephone, suggests anything rather than a

friendly disposition towards things British.

image in 1921 and held British passports as natives of Nigeria, were set

or out in Jeddah by the local police, and were being beaten at the city ga

ary to being taken for military services to Mecca before their father can

from the agency. I telegraphed at once to the King requesting their

be noted. In voluminous later correspondence the King

benevolence in giving free barrack accommodation to vagrants

and in clothing them (in uniform) and medically treating them free of charge. I had

to request that British subjects might be exempted from the exercise of this charitable

measure. To my objection at the treatment of the men's sister, who, in endeavouring

to shield them from the police, was brutally cut over the breast, the King replied with

a dissertation on the low morality of Jeddah butter-sellers, adding that, as for the

police, "they are doing their work well, thank God." I could only reply that my

protest was directed not against their efficiency, but against the nature of the work

given them to do.

The men in question were not vagrants, nor is the son of the Mecca agent of

the British Empire. These four men are so terrified of eventual royal reprimand that they are anxious that I

should not intervene on their behalf. The same humiliating conviction, that the

Hashimite Government can do British subjects in the Hedjaz more harm than the

British Government can good, deters the dewan of the local Patni Indian community

from invoking official aid in the prosecution of a large claim against the Jeddah customs

authorities. This is the spirit, a broken spirit, for which King Hussein works. There

is not a kick left in the Indian community in Mecca.

If there were any reasonableness or any equity in Hashimite Government methods would be less deplorable.

Rida Ali Khan, a reputable merchant of Bareilly (U.P.), was arrested (almost certainly in mistake for some one else), while performing his Haj ceremonies in August by the Hashimite Government. Only on the 28th January, after the most vigorous search had never even been formulated.

In a case between two British Indians, heard before the Jeddah Court during the autumn, the Qadi, bribed by the plaintiff and in the most blatant defiance of certified evidence which he had himself called upon the defendant to produce, condemned the latter to pay the former 1,400 rupees. Judgment had not been executed when the plaintiff applied to me for permission to proceed to Egypt. I am happy to say that as a result of careful exploitation of this circumstance, the case has now been settled out of Court—the plaintiff paying the defendant 1,000 rupees, and giving him satisfaction in other directions.

I have referred in some detail to specific instances, not because these are isolated from the files of the Hashimite Government, but because in May 1920, the King Hussein has taken to achieve recognition of his claim on His Majesty's Government. Until he himself, or his sense of grievance, be removed, every path will be closed to get home on us. His occasional failures hurt us, and it will be realised that he has succeeded in Mecca of which, in the absence of any British representative there, this agency only hears after the desired effect has been already made upon the local British.

H.M.S. "Cornflower," Incident off Seron

On the 22nd January, H.M.S. "Cornflower" arrived at Jeddah, and remained until the late afternoon. Her visit and her programme for a three or four days cruise between Jeddah and Isth were the result of the recently reported activity in slave traffic between Midi and Ruia.

On the 26th January, the following telegram was received from Port Sudan —

Following from H.M.S. "Cornflower" dhow off Seron, 125 miles 184 from Jeddah, reports boarding by rifle fire. Driving crew ashore. Suggest you get corps from Jeddah to capture about dozen

Thus, owing to the telegraphic omission of a decimal point, was taken as referring from Jeddah approximately 180), or to the Island of Sara (latitude 19 40, and a correction from Port Sudan read 125 miles 184 from Jeddah, that is, 125 miles south of Jeddah, unfortunately confirmed as misapprehension of the facts.

Bahrish and a machine gun. Their departure was delayed until the morning of the 27th January. H.M.S. "Cornflower" was asked to effect contact with them. The commander was also asked whether the despatch of a second party by land from Jeddah was considered most tact. Believing that the scene of the incident lay some distance to the west of Jeddah, I am sending a land force to demonstrate, as if of right, in disputed territory.

In fact, the place Seron in question will be found on the chart 19½ miles south of Jeddah. The Hashimite dhow was met by H.M.S. "Cornflower" on the 28th January, and the local marine force spent some days ashore, searching for the men who had fired on the "Cornflower's" boats.

A copy of Commander Campbell's report is attached.

He brought the captured dhow to Jeddah on the 29th January and here awaited instructions as to its disposal. These were received on the 4th February. The moral effect of the presence of H.M.S. "Cornflower," with dhow, in Jeddah harbour, is likely to be excellent.

I have been unable to ascertain what prompted the occupants of the hostile dhow to take the action they did. It was at first believed that they were slave-traders

returning to Midi with the proceeds of Hedjaz sales but from conversation between their fellow-tribesmen, overheard by an agent, it appears that they were from the Rabigh district—the dhow is known to hail from Rabigh—and were proceeding to the Yemen to purchase supplies in order to evade the King's virtual blockade of unruly tribes along that coast. Either explanation would account for their bad consciences, and the latter is probably the true one.

Two arrests were made by the Hashimite marine force at Seron, but the men arrested were released, their innocence being certified by the Jeddah authorities. Thus none of those who fired upon the White Ensign from Hashimite territory have yet been captured. The King informs me that he has charged the Emir-ul-Urbah to continue the search.

The King material for several let Government are reproached with their neglect to supply steamships, with indulgence towards arms smuggling into other coast and with an invidious discrimination against those waters in their exercise of slave-traffic control.

I am endeavouring to obtain from the Hashimite Government a statement of opinion on the subject of the importation of slaves into the Hedjaz.

Medina.

A recent arrival from Medina reports that a profound impression, and one very favourable to Ibn Saud, has been caused by his bloodless capture of Hail and by his subsequent conciliatory policy. The first feeling of the Medians in relation was one of alarm, due in great part to the fear of disorderly Bedouin elements in and around the town, and there were signs of a movement towards stampede. But Ibn Saud is reported to have instructed the tribes of that district to profit by the November rains for the cultivation of their land, and to have promised no aggressive action for a period of at least four months. Consequently, Ibn Saud is locally lauded as a wise, benevolent and in every respect desirable ruler, and should he approach Medina, opposition to him would be, as far as the populace is concerned, hardly more than formal.

Shereef Shalad, the Kaimakam of Medina, has also gained in favour with the inhabitants by a relaxation of his despotic methods. In his character as the champion of the Medians, Shereef Ahmed Mansur, the acting Governor, thirty individuals whom the King had ordered to be exiled to Mecca.

Reports of the extension of an atmosphere favourable to Ibn Saud and to the propagation of Wahabite tenets, to the tribes along the Hedjaz railway, find confirmation in King Hussein's often expressed anxiety. He has sent to me an original proclamation addressed by Abdurrahman ibn-Tunayan to the people of El Ala, attacking Shereef Mansur and the Government to the advantage of Ibn Saud. The seal on this document has, however, been intentionally obliterated.

The King also complains of propaganda among the Fugara, the Sha'lan, Taywayah and Beni Jazi sections of the Huwailat, made on the strength of the Sultan's letter to Fathan-al-Azla. He assumes that His Majesty's Government can, but will not, take steps to check this dissemination of propaganda, and he reiterates ad nauseam willingness to hand over the country to Ibn Saud or to any other Emir whom Great Britain may select.

King Hussein's own methods have done more than anything else to promote conditions favourable to his rival. Were he not so unpopular propaganda directed against him would not find such ready acceptance. But, whatever the cause, it is, I believe, the fact that the ground is being well prepared for some such dramatic report for the period ending the 31st December last. If Ibn Saud is to be induced by His Majesty's Government to use his influence to check the further spread of Mudayyin tenets within Hedjaz borders, he will have to show a field of very rapidly extending promise. It seems almost impossible that he should possess the influence to achieve this: the movement proceeds by its own impetus, favoured by the circumstances of local discontent. But unless and until Ibn Saud formally disclaims responsibility for any revolutionary action by his friends in the Hedjaz, and elsewhere outside Nejd, King Hussein will continue to see in such activity the hand of His Majesty's Government supporting the Sultan of Nejd, and all the forces of militant heresy against him.

The Emir Ali, who left Mecca for Medina via Yambo with an escort of 400 camels

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

should occur due to any ... of one of the Emirs, Great Britain shall then render to the Government in question moral and material aid to quell this insurrection until it ends. This assistance in the quelling of insurrections or revolts is to hold good until such time as the said Arab Government be firmly established."

The paper attributes Ibn Saud's alleged defeat of the Hedjaz forces to British aid, ... request, reproduces extracts from King Hussein's address to the Deys' delegation and ends by blaming British and French statesmen for the present state of affairs.

No. 554 reproduces from the "Carmel" of Palestine an account of an interview with the ... expresses his desire for Arab unity under one strong Arab Government.

Also two articles from "Al Mowattam" of ... enthusiastic appeal to Arabs to work in unity.

There is a lengthy account of the farewells ... departure for Medina.

... The Allies are blamed for dividing up among themselves Arab territories, despite their promises, and so of committing the same breach of faith which King Hussein is charged by the "Times."

The "Times" report that a Hedjaz delegation is discussing terms of peace and friendship with the Imam in the grounds that a new diplomatic relations already exist between the Imam and the Hedjaz.

... medicine is officially forbidden to men not holding diplomas or ... of qualification.

No. 556, the rumour that the Hedjaz Government has disposed of any part of the H. railway to Europeans is denied and occasion is taken again to protest against French usurpation of the northern section of this railway.

No. 557 ... No. 558 announces the arrival of the Imam's delegation and publishes the speeches made at the inauguration of the School of Agriculture in Mecca.

L. B. GRAFFTEY-SMITH
Acting British Agent.

Enclature 2 in No. 180

Report by Commander Campbell on the Capture of a Hostile Dhow off Seron.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to report that on Sunday, the 22nd January, 1910, the U.S. "Cornflower" at Jeddah, January 31, 1910: Jeddah, in accordance with orders to patrol the Red Sea, captured a hostile dhow of the name ... Officer, Red Sea Patrol.

2. On Monday, the 23rd January sent boat with Sub-Lieutenant to examine a dhow anchored under reef some 15 miles south of Jeddah. Population walked on board, and dhow was found empty and very sanitary. A woman and child on foremast were the only people who remained in dhow.

Tuesday, the 24th January. Proceeded about 4 1/2 miles down coast, intending to search a dhow which had been seen anchored there the previous day. ... 1° 54' N., longitude 39° 44' E.

4. On closing this dhow at Seron, I observed that occupants behaved in a suspicious manner, most of them leaving burials in dhow ...

... to approach within about four or five hundred yards, when rifle fire was opened on ... from the island and the dhow. ... to which I replied by waving. As soon as fire was opened I retired, and, on way off to ...

(R975)

3 K 2

Colonial Office to Foreign Office.—(Received March 4.)

Sir,

Downing Street, March 3, 1922

I AM directed by Mr. Secretary Churchill to refer to paragraph 2 of this Department's letter of the 3rd March on the subject of the revision of the Treaty of Sèvres, and to offer the following observations on the question of boundaries in connection with article 27 of that treaty.

2. The section of the frontier with which this Department would normally be concerned is that defined in paragraph 11 (3) of article 27. With regard to this section of the frontier I am to refer to this Department's letter of the 5th January 1922 with which was transmitted copy of a despatch of the 9th December, 1921, from the High Commissioner for Iraq. Mr. Churchill adheres to the recommendations made in that letter, and requests that advantage may be taken of the opportunity afforded in the impending discussions on the Treaty of Sèvres to secure a rectification of this section of the frontier in the direction which Sir P. Cox indicates. I am to request that Lord Curzon's especial attention may be invited to the desirability of extending Amadia from the territory remaining to Turkey, not only for reasons, since this village is a strategic point of the utmost importance to the Government of Iraq, but also for political reasons, since it is the home of a large number of the Assyrians who were recently repatriated by His Majesty's Government, and for degree of moral responsibility.

3. Mr. Churchill is not aware what attitude Lord Curzon proposes to adopt towards the recently concluded Franco-Kemalist Agreement, which altered the boundary between Syria and Turkey as defined.

information at Mr. Churchill's disposal the French authorities are not in effective occupation of this wedge of territory, nor does it appear that they will be so in the near future. Mr. Churchill is not aware to what extent the French authorities are in possession of the Tigris, but he presumes that the fact that they have now handed back to Turkey the Syrian section of the Baghdad Railway, which is, so far as he is aware, the only means by which such access could be maintained, points to the French Government

as the maintenance of friendly relations with Turkey. I am to transmit herewith copy of telegrams No. 116 of the 9th February and Nos. 120 and 121 of the 10th February from the High Commissioner for Iraq, with copy of this Department's telegram No. 79 of the 3rd February, to which they were a reply. Mr. Churchill presumes that the "unnumbered telegram of the 3rd February," referred to in Sir P. Cox's telegram No. 116 in the second part of this Department's telegram No. 79 of the 3rd February, which was not repeated to the High Commissioner for Palestine, Lord Curzon will observe that King Feisal is not in possession of the territory of Iraq. He regards the

This appears to be a matter for the British Government. But the inclusion of the strip north of the Nisibin and Jezret ul-Umar, and the road between them. In

view of the more important adjustments recommended in Sir P. Cox's despatch of the 9th December, to which reference was made in paragraph 2 of this letter, it appears unlikely that the Turks would agree to make this concession, and Mr. Churchill does not suggest that it should be pressed for. There remains the question whether the wedge of territory south of the Jezret-ul-Umar-Nisibin line should remain Syrian territory or be included in Iraq. Mr. Churchill understands that King Feisal, apart from his natural desire that as large an Arab population as possible should be included

the memorandum from the General Staff, Iraq army, enclosed in Sir P. Cox's despatch No. 24 of the 9th January, of which a copy is enclosed. In view of articles 16 and 17 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, Mr. Churchill assumes that the General Staff of the Iraq army are mistaken in their assumption that passage would not be afforded through Syrian territory to British or Iraq forces in the event of Turkish aggression against Iraq. Mr. Churchill assumes that in the event of Turkish aggression against Iraq, any action by Imperial forces against Turkish troops in retroceded territory would in any case be justified, even if for this purpose it were necessary for aircraft to fly over Syrian territory. He would be glad of Lord Curzon's views on these two points at the earliest possible date, since it appears to him that, if it were understood that this wedge of territory did not constitute an insuperable barrier to communication by British or Iraq forces against the Turkish lines of communications, an immediate communication in this sense should be made both to the French Government and to H. M. Government.

Mr. Churchill, of course, prepared to give due weight to any arguments advanced by King Feisal, but he is himself disposed to regard the question from the administrative rather than from the military point of view. An additional argument for the inclusion in Iraq of the wedge of territory referred to above is that it is inhabited by Arab tribes who are economically dependent upon Mosul. Mr. Churchill does not propose to deal in this letter with the whole question of the Anglo-French frontier as originally defined by the Anglo-French Convention of the 23rd December, 1920, but some reference to the northern sector of this frontier is made in connection with the question of the Turkish frontier, since the Treaty of Sèvres questions the point at which the Turkish frontier comes to march with Syria. It appears to Mr. Churchill that a good case could be made with the French Government for pressing for the inclusion of the Nisibin-Jezret-ul-Umar section of the Turkish frontier in paragraph 11 (3) of article 27. A possible line of argument would be as follows: It is to be noted that when negotiating the Convention of 1920 the British and French Governments were themselves bound to

Government must therefore claim that, in return for their recognition of the Franco-Kemalist boundary, their own wishes with regard to the taking-off point of the Anglo-French Convention line from the Turkish frontier, as ultimately defined, should be taken into friendly consideration by the French Government. Their view is that the taking-off point should be in the immediate neighbourhood of Nisibin, but far enough to the east of that town to leave the railroad and the town itself in Turkish hands. If this proposal were accepted, the necessary readjustments of the Anglo-French Convention line could be discussed independently by the British and French Governments.

5. Mr. Churchill understands from Colonel Newcombe, who has just returned from Palestine via Paris, that the President of the Council has declined to agree to the proposal made by the two boundary commissioners that the convention frontier should be moved for the section from Ras-el-Nakura to El Hamme, and has taken the ground that the modifications proposed exceeded, in his opinion, the powers of boundary commissioners, and that the whole question must be reserved for discussion between the British and French Governments in connection with the revision of the Treaty of Sèvres. If the attitude of the French Government is correctly represented by Colonel Newcombe, there appears to be no great difficulty in the way of inducing the French Government to reconsider the whole question of the Anglo-French frontier, not only in connection with that portion of the line on which the boundary commissioners have actually been working, but in connection with the line as a whole. Mr. Churchill will be prepared to offer his observations on the subject of the alignment of the Anglo-French frontier as soon as he has been made acquainted with Lord Curzon's views on his

J E SHUCKBROUGH

Sir P Cox to Mr Churchill

(Telegraphic) P

Bagdad, February 9, 1922

In reply, both myself and the General Officer Commanding are of the opinion that there is no strategic objection to giving Turks this wedge, and in view of the fact that the further south from Niabon the Turks bring their line of communications, the more valuable would it become, it would be slightly advantageous to follow this course. Moreover, the important line of communication between Niabon and Jezirat is also vulnerable so long as wedge is Turkish, whereas unless Irak had right of moving troops through wedges it would be protected if it were French.

I am telegraphing separately as regards boundaries as a whole and Feisal's views

Sir P Cox to Mr C Churchill

(Telegraphic) P.

Revised February 10, 1922.

As a magnetic boundary south of Euphrates, between Abu Kemal and Imtar (see fig. 1), the 39th parallel of longitude was temporarily accepted as provisional from

commission, I personally think with that reservation that it might stand for
 (1) as provisional (one group), but in a separate telegram conveying Fernald's

Sir P Cox to Mr Churchill

(Telegraphic) P

Bahdad, February 10, 1922

First, north of Euphrates. Jauregui-Umar and Nasibon should, he claims, both

As regards wedge north of Khabur-Kamelan, he claims that its possession is indispensable [one corr. group, to Iraq, but he would prefer it should be in the hands of Turks than of the French if it cannot be held by Iraq Government, however, that country south of Jezira specifically recognised as Arab zone "A" in Sykes-Picot Agreement and further that France and England mutually undertook that only to an Arab State should territory the zones assigned to them respectively be abudated (Article 2 and article 10 in presumably refers to). Thus France in 1916 in concluding the Sykes-Picot Agreement accepted the principles which she accepted in

As regards the frontier south of the Taurus, the Turkish Government would like to see the provisional boundary between Iraq and Transjordan in the north, and the boundary between Iraq and Syria, but points out that it would involve a change of alignment if the British Government's representations as regards the

Mr. Churchill to Sir P. Coe

With regard to the Irish question I am anxious for a considered recommendation as to final boundary alignment. What do you consider the arguments for and against readjusting Anglo-French boundary, so that the Irish to Turkey may be restored and consequently Dublin? I should be glad to be informed on my own, but you should hold out no hope to convention line.

(First part repeated to Jerusalem.)

Secretary to the High Commissioner for Trade Colonial Office

(No. 244. Secret.)

BY direction of his Excellency the High Commissioner for Iraq, a memorandum from the Ministry of Defence is forwarded, with compliments to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in continuation of High Commissioner's telegram No. 946 dated the 31st December, 1931.

Bagdad, January 9, 1922

Memorandum on the Jaxxat-Kesidin "Wedge"

SECRET

The recent Franco-Kemalist Agreement has produced a situation in which the Turkish Government is in a position to demand that the British Government should withdraw its troops from the Turkish frontier.

the security of the frontier. It respects handicaps the Irak Government both from a military and political point of view in the measures necessary for the maintenance of security in the northern portion of the country.

The boundaries of the French zone of influence are not very definitely known to the Ministry, but it appears that the new boundary between this zone and the zone of the Anglo-French Agreement is the Bagdad Railway as far as Nisibin, and thence to Jeziret-ibn-Omar.

As regards the Irak boundary: the existing line of demarcation between Irak and the French zone is understood to run approximately from Faish Khabur on the Tigris, over the Karachuk Dagh and Jebel Sinjar, to El Kaim on the Euphrates.

A wedge, therefore, of territory under French influence and having no connection with the State of Irak lies between the northern boundary of this country from the Tigris westwards and the Turkish frontier.

The existence of this wedge of territory, in view of recent pronouncements on the part of the French Government, even if it does not afford a complete guarantee against Kemalist aggression across it, at least ensures that in such an event French pressure on the Anglo-French Government may be relied upon in support of this country.

There is, however, another aspect of the case which is not so favourable to this country.

The existence of the wedge, whilst preventing any aggression by the Kemalist forces from this quarter (unless French neutrality be violated), at the same time offers a Turkish line of communication with Jeziret-ibn-Omar. The result is that should the Kemalist forces attempt operations from Jeziret-ibn-Omar against Zakho and Mosul, they can effect their concentration, and maintain their supplies and reinforcements with ease as to their line of communication to their right rear.

Should the Kemalist attack fail or a truce be concluded, the result would be to leave the Turkish forces in a position to assist in Irak the coming of that national spirit which is the only final guarantee of the safety of the country.

In the opinion of the Irak General Staff, the correct stroke to a Kemalist advance, either east or west of the Tigris, is a threat to their communications, which are vulnerable along the whole length from Ras-al-Ain to Jeziret. A raid on them or on the important towns in this area could be organised very largely from Arab tribes west of the Tigris, with, as a nucleus, a small body of regular mounted troops. The existence of such a threat would hamper the enemy and force him either to shift his communications to the north (in which case the danger to his town remains) or to detach troops to guard his exposed flank.

It is therefore submitted that the right should be reserved to the military forces of the country to traverse this wedge of country in the case of Turkish aggression against the northern boundaries of Irak.

It is further submitted as a matter for consideration whether it is not possible as to change the line of demarcation between Irak and the French zone as to include in the former the whole of Jebel Sinjar and as much as possible of the Shammar territory.

In order to prepare for the offensive-defensive outlined above, it might be necessary to station a small force of regular troops on the part of the Kemalists.

It would also appear desirable, from an administrative point of view, to have a small force of the French authorities. It would also appear desirable, from an administrative point of view, to have a small force of the French authorities.

aspect of the question is not one for consideration by the Ministry.

NOURY SAID,

Irak Army Headquarters.

Bagdad, December 28, 1921

E 2959 656 911

No 182

Acting Consul Graffley-Smith to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received March 17)

(No 14 Secret.)

My Lord,

Jeddah, February 28, 1922.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith the Jeddah report for the period 11th to 26th February, 1922.

Copies of this despatch and report have been sent to Cairo, Bagdad, Jerusalem, Aden, Delhi and Transjordan.

I have, &c

L. B. GRAFFLEY-SMITH

Acting British Agent

Enclosure 1 in No. 182

Jeddah Report, February 11-28, 1922

His Majesty King Hussein has been informed that the British Government regret that he should find it necessary to take this step, they realise the matter to be one for him to settle with his people.

The reply of His Majesty's Government to King Hussein on the 27th February was communicated to him on the 24th February. He was informed that while His Majesty's Government regret that he should find it necessary to take this step, they realise the matter to be one for him to settle with his people.

The gist of His Majesty's acknowledgment of this message is that his people, having had nothing to do with his original action, nor with his reliance upon Great Britain, have no qualifications to decide as to his movements now.

I have had several hours of conversation with the King since his arrival in Jeddah, either alone or in the presence of Zeid and Sheikh Fudh. Of abdication there has been no mention, beyond the usual reiteration of his willingness to hand over the country to Him Saud, and a statement that he considers himself responsible to God and to Great Britain, but not to his people. I could only assure him that his anxiety as to the future of his country was at least equally notorious; that he himself had frequently referred to it, and that His Majesty's Government felt that he should be guided in this matter by the considerations which his sentiment dictated.

His abdication is a development so profoundly desirable, so universally hoped for by all who have the interests of this country and of Arabia at heart, that I was tempted for a moment to provoke him to whatever action an access of rage might inspire. But

increasingly clear at each interview that King Hussein will abandon dignity, but not

His Majesty's Government's message to save his face. It seems better to let him stay where he is, with the latter reflection that he is not personally indispensable to us, rather than to give him any excuse for thinking that the British attitude towards his personal tenure of the throne, formerly friendly, now neutral, should have become definitely hostile.

A telegram has been received from the High Commissioner, Bagdad, expressing King Faisal's desire to have Eour Zeid to stay with him for a while.

This innocuous request King Hussein has exploited to justify himself for not abdicating. He pretends to consider Zeid's visit to Bagdad as something to which His Majesty's Government attach tremendous importance—"else why should Sir Percy Cox, who does not know Zeid, ask for him?" If the British Government ask King Hussein to send them his son Zeid—(I follow his line of argument)—they cannot be so different to the personal importance of King Hussein as their official message about abdication would suggest. They really know, whatever they may say, that King

[5975]

3 L 2

Hussein and no one else must rule over the Hedjaz . . . and so on. The fact that Faisal had already asked his father to send Zeid, and had been told that King Hussein would consider it if it were put up through the British authorities, is sufficient commentary on this rather pathetic manifestation of outraged vanity.

His Majesty spoke at great length during our interviews of the treaty signed at Amman. I did my best to convince him that he would not, by the act of ratification, prejudice his case for the settlement of frontiers between himself and Ibn Saud. In the Amman treaty King Hussein's own frontiers are undefined, and Ibn Saud, to a version of which, dated the 22nd January, 1915, the King constantly refers, frontiers are left for later definition. If His Majesty would ratify the Amman treaty, His Majesty's Government would, if desired, at once use the offices to promote and assist a settlement.

These considerations I have, in conversation and by letter, urged upon King Hussein, and I have deplored his obvious suspicion of our motives. Promises in Amman (Gherad Qali and Acting Prime Minister) with whom I had two long conversations recently in Jeddah, and, I understand, by Emir Abdulla. But King Hussein insists that, pending the arbitration of His Majesty's Government, Ibn Saud should retire behind a provisional line practically identical with that for which the King has no useful purpose in telegraphing this suggestion to His Majesty's Government and there the matter at present stands.

King Hussein recently requested the Italian representative to inform his Government that the King would be pleased to receive an invitation to the Genoa Conference. A message was sent, and an unfavourable reply received from Rome. The King has never mentioned the Genoa Conference to me.

Yemen Delegation.

The Yemen delegate left on the 22nd February for Aden, the idea of a tour to Medina and Amman having been suddenly abandoned. The Qali ul-Qudlah of Mecca and Sheikh Fawal of Khafih were sent to Jeddah to bid him farewell.

Pilgrims.

The steamship "Toucor" arrived on the 21st February bringing the first of the season's pilgrims, 238 in number. The steamship "Nelmia" on the 25th February brought 141. The "Memuke," "Patroclius" and "Prometheus" arrived on the 27th February with 763, 327 and 451 pilgrims respectively. These boats came from the Netherlands East Indies and Singapore. All received clean bills of health from Kamaran. The pilgrims arriving by the "Toucor" and the "Nelmia" were sent to the islands and "Prometheus" pilgrims are to be detained for seventy-two hours on the islands on the ground that the bills of health issued to them in Batavia show that there is plague there. Thabet Bey, the Director General of Quarantine, thus testifies early in the season to his conviction that international conventions are made to be ignored, and that Kamaran, in non-Arab hands, serves no useful purpose. I hope strongly to represent to the King that his support of this ignorant and unscrupulous person is directly prejudicial to his own best interests.

These pilgrims . . .

... bag, value . . . p. 2 of my . . . 3, per article leaving the . . .

... and . . .

Tariffs of licensed charges by Mutawwifin have been drawn up under the auspices of a high-sounding but non-existent pilgrim control board. That communicated to the Dutch consul purports to announce the tariff of expenses of pilgrims coming from all the Moslem world, but its charges are higher than those set forth in the "Tariff for Indian and Bengali Pilgrims" communicated to me. This discrepancy is the result of private arrangements between the sheikhs of Javanese pilgrims in Mecca and the King who, in consideration of a large sum down, allows these sheikhs to extort extra dues from Javanese pilgrims.

I enclose translations of both these documents, with the Arabic of that affecting Indians.* Their value as a tariff is considerably diminished by the proviso about "voluntary donations," upon the interpretation of which the Hedjaz Government and the pilgrims will probably hold different opinions.

Mecca.

All shopkeepers, auctioneers and pedlars have been ordered to find some one to stand vouch for their professional character and financial standing. A tax varying from P.T. 20 to 40 is charged for the obligatory Government endorsement of the record of this formality.

No camel may be sold in Mecca for more than 15 majidias (P.T. 500), and the Government alone has the right to purchase.

Small pox is still prevalent among the Bedouin around Mecca, but less so among the townsfolk. I learn that there is an epidemic of influenza in Mecca.

Medina.

The Emir Ali reached Medina on the 22nd February. A party of merchants who left Medina on the 3rd February reported on the 18th February that Sheerif Sa'ud of Kaimakam of Medina, expected dismissal on the 18th February. He was reported to oppose His Highness.

There are in Mecca . . .

King Hussein commented earlier in the month to the departure of a "rukab," a . . . to proceed from Mecca to Medina for the ceremonies of Sayedna Hamza. The departure of this "rukab" has now been forbidden.

It is rumoured at Medina that the Emir Ali will not stay long there, but will proceed to Amman to consult with his brother Abdulla about common policy. Activity at the Medina railway station has increased since it was reported that A . . . shortly to visit Abdulla or that the latter will visit his brother in Medina.

Aviation.

... all the other Russian mechanics except M. Maximof are to leave the country. Eleven Italians, pilots and mechanics, have been telegraphed for from Italy.

(a.) Captain J. B. Bohler, Royal Corps of Signals, visited Jeddah from the . . . to reporting to the Sudan Government on the possibility of establishing regular . . .

The suggestion that such communication might be arranged was made by the Hashimite Government.

(b.) Jeddah sambuk (lighter)men are now constrained to pay to the Government as tax one fifth of their takings.

(c.) King Hussein has sent me, to see and return, a banner captured from the Wahhabis by the Beni Shehr (of Asir).

* Not printed.

(d.) Two more British subjects, one a Nigerian pilgrim holding a passport for the 1921 pilgrimage, have been taken by the local authorities for military service. I am endeavouring to obtain their release.

(e.) Mr. D. Lambie, junior of the two British clerks at this agency, proceeded to the United Kingdom on well-earned leave of absence on the 22nd February. The pressure of work in this agency, always considerable (the office has been closed for part of two days only since May last)—will be much felt during his absence by the remaining British clerk and myself.

Press. "Al Qibla."

No. 561 publishes an official proclamation stating, as unjustifiable, that Medina is threatened by the Wahhabis.

No. 562 reproduces the denials of the rumour that King Hussein contemplates disposing by sale of the Hejaz Railway.

The remaining numbers contain little of interest.

L. R. GRAFFTEY SMITH

Enclosure 2 in No. 182

n 1

THE Pilgrim Control Board established at Jeddah announces the following tariff of necessary expenses of those of our Muslim brethren of the eastern and western world who purpose fulfilling the obligations of pilgrimage for the preservation of their rights of journey to Jeddah and thence to Mecca through the agent of their Mutawwif, in accordance with the decision of the eminent Committee of Experts.

Any one of our pilgrim brethren who may consider a charge exceeding those now fixed to have been imposed should refer to the local Government, unless he desires this to be considered as a personal donation. As for those wishing to incur their own expenses, they are at liberty to do so.

1. Sambuk fare from steamer (outside the harbour) to the wharf. All pilgrims ... 12
2. Sambuk fare from steamer (half way) to the wharf. All pilgrims ... 7
3. Sambuk fare from steamer to the wharf. All pilgrims ... 7
4. Charges for carrying every pilgrim's luggage (big or small) from the wharf to the lodging. These charges are for Javanese, Egyptian, Cape Colony, coast of Africa, Oman, Bahrain, Moorish and Persian pilgrims ... 1
5. Charges for carrying the luggage of Turkish, Bokharan, Bulgarian, Y ... 1
6. Charges for carrying the luggage from the sambuk ... 2
7. Charges for carrying the luggage from the sambuk ... 2
8. Charges for carrying the luggage from the sambuk ... 2
9. Charges for carrying the luggage from the sambuk ... 2
10. For the Mutawwif agent at Jeddah, including portage of luggage of the pilgrim from the lodging and charges for Naqib ... 20
11. Municipality charges per shukuf for all pilgrims ... 2

12. The Pilgrim Control Board has considered closely the services rendered to the Javanese pilgrims by their Mutawwif after their arrival at Mecca and up to their departure to their home, including house-rent at Mecca and oil, during their stay and their feeding on the first day, the day of Arafat and the four days of Muna, charges for tents at Arafat and house-rent at Muna; oil, wood, water and tea or coffee and camel hire for carrying tents and provisions and other necessary things for these places, and the Board has decided that the charges for all these services will be 22½ dollars (Sincho) per person ...

13. For the Zennar water man, per person, 2 rupees, for the Javanese, Indian and Bengali pilgrims ...

As the camel hire and shukuf charge to Mecca, Arafat and Medina and back to Jeddah depend on the supply of camels and price of matting, these will be decided ...

Pilgrim Tariff (Indian and Bengali Pilgrims).

After preamble as in general tariff —

	Rupiah	Annan
1. Sambuk fare (outside the harbour), per person ...	1	4
2. Sambuk fare (half way), per person	18
3. Sambuk fare (inside the harbour), per person	10
4. Charge for carrying Indian pilgrims luggage (small or big) to the house	2
5. Charge for carrying Bengali pilgrims luggage (small or big) to the house
6. Charge for lodging during the first three nights (in case of staying), per person	4
7. Charge for lodging for more than the three nights
8. Balisbeh dues for shukuf
9. For services rendered by Jeddah agent
10. For services rendered by Mecca Mutawwif
11. Charge for lodging at Mecca, per person
12. For the Zennar water man, per person
13. For the tent during the days of pilgrimage, per person (Indian and Bengali)
14. Charge for servant up to Mecca

As the camel hire and shukuf charge to Mecca, Arafat and Medina and back to Jeddah depend on the supply of camels and price of matting, these will be decided ...

Shipping Intelligence for Period February 11-28, 1922

	To—	Arrived	Left	Pilgrim Disembarked	Remarks
		1922	1922		
		Feb 11	Feb 12		
Arabia					
Aden					
Yemen					
India					
Bombay					
Calcutta					
Rangoon					
Singapore					
Penang					
Malacca					
Sumatra					
Batavia					
Sourabaya					
Medan					

E 2403/56/65]

No. 183.

Foreign Office to Colonial Office.

Foreign Office, March 17, 1922

Sir,

I AM directed by the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3rd March regarding the possible revision of article 27 of the Treaty of Sèvres with reference to the boundaries of Iraq.

2. The recommendations made by your Department regarding the revision of the Iraq east of the Tigris have already been carefully noted by this Department, and when the time comes for detailed revision of the actual clauses of the treaty, every effort will be made to secure the most advantageous of the four lines proposed as the frontier in the final treaty.

3. Lord Curzon notes—and agrees with—the views of Mr. Secretary Churchill that it is not to be pressed for. As Mr. Churchill points out, the further question whether the point where the boundary between Syria and Iraq meets the southern frontier of Turkey should be pushed westwards to a point just east of the line runs an Anglo-French line and the revision of the Anglo-French Convention of 23rd December 1920, rather than that of the Treaty of Sèvres, in which little more than a drafting change in the provisions of article 27 would be required.

4. Lord Curzon appreciates the force of the argument, which has indeed already been emphasized in correspondence with the French Government, that the agreement of Angora was made by France without consultation with His Majesty's Government and therefore without proper regard for the interests of Iraq, but he is not clear how such an argument could in fact be elaborated in detail—and in a manner likely to convince the French—in order to prove the necessity for the transfer to Iraq from Syria of the wedge of Syrian territory south of the Nahr el-Jazirah-Omar line. Neither ethnographically nor strategically does the case for such a transfer seem clear. Geographically the French Government are hardly likely to admit that the Arab population of Iraq should be increased at the expense of the Arab population of Syria. Strategically it appears difficult, in view of the assurances given to His Majesty's Government by the French Government in the course of the correspondence regarding the Pact of Angora, to cast doubt on French intentions with regard to the prevention of Turkish attacks on Iraq across this wedge of Syrian territory. It might, of course,

French forces for some time—but on the other hand, it would be necessary to support this argument by emphasizing the ability of Iraq on their side to garrison this territory against the Turks, and his Lordship understands that Iraq forces will not in fact be in a position to do this for a considerable

5. Quite apart from this aspect of the matter, Lord Curzon is extremely doubtful in this manner to reopen with the French the Convention of 23rd December, 1920, some fifteen months after its conclusion. It must be recalled that it was only after long and difficult negotiations that the French Government were persuaded to modify the

1916 in such a way as to increase the territory of Palestine and to leave the Mosul area to Mesopotamia. The French Government were in fact seriously attacked at the time for the concessions on the Sykes-Picot Agreement made by France in the convention of the 23rd December, 1920.

6. Lord Curzon is not aware of the precise modifications in other parts of the frontier laid down by the above-mentioned convention which have been mooted, but he believes that the cession of the Yarmuk Valley to Great Britain in return for the part of the Druse territory and of half the town of Abu Kemal has been discussed between the local authorities on both sides, and that the Iraq Government desire to include the whole of Jebel Sinjar in Iraq. I am to point out, however, that, as far as Lord Curzon is aware, the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Paris has never countenanced these local negotiations or indicated in any way that it approves so general a reopening of the

El Hamme, Lord Curzon understands that the delimitation in question does not modify the frontier as laid down in the convention of the 23rd December, 1920, to a degree which would entail the reopening of the latter agreement. His Majesty's Ambassador at Paris, in reply to enquiries, has also now reported that the French Government merely prefer to sign the delimitation of the frontier laid down by the convention of

1920 as a whole and not piecemeal, and that, contrary to Colonel Newcombe's information, they are not raising specific objections to the delimitation as far as El Hamme, and do not desire to raise the question at the forthcoming conference in Paris.

7. Lastly, I am to point out that the latter conference in Paris, which opens on the 22nd March, is primarily designed to bring to an end the Greco-Turkish conflict and to secure peace with Turkey. Lord Curzon would therefore be reluctant to broach a question which only concerns France and Great Britain and must inevitably lead to considerable controversy between them.

8. In these circumstances Lord Curzon trusts that Mr. Churchill will not press for the proposed shifting of the boundary between Syria and Iraq westwards to N. At the same time this recommendation will not be lost sight of should there arise a question of a specific concession by Great Britain to France which might be suitably linked up with the cession of this wedge of territory to Iraq and be made the subject of a bargain.

9. With regard to articles 16 and 17 of the Covenant of the League of Nations

their territory to forces of members of the League co-operating to the aid of the League do not come into play unless the aid of the League for the settlement of the dispute has been invoked and unless the non-member should have refused to accept the obligations of temporary membership of the League for the purpose of the dispute and should have resorted to war against the member. In that case the effect of the provisions would be that a member of the League (e.g., France) would be bound to allow passage through her territory including territory under a mandate, such as Syria, to the forces of any member of the League (e.g., Great Britain) who was co-operating to protect the covenants of the League. If the non-member State was a non-member of the League (e.g., Turkey), Lord Curzon sees no objection to a communication in this sense being made to King Faisal, but he sees no reason to draw the attention of the French Government to these articles of the Covenant at this stage. For the rest, should Turkey in fact attack Iraq across the 8th parallel, or otherwise, Lord Curzon feels sure that not only in view of the assurances given by the French Government to His Majesty's Government in connection with the Pact, but also in virtue of the alliance which must be held to continue as long as there is a state of war with both France and Great Britain, the French Government could not refuse to allow Iraq land and air forces either to cross this or Syrian territory, which the French are unable at present to occupy in order to prevent the Turks, or a fortiori to attack any Turkish forces that may be using the coasts of the Gulf.

10. Copies of this letter have been sent to the India Office, War Office and Air Ministry.

I am, &c

LANCLOT OLIPHANT.

E 3387 656 91]

No. 184

Acting Consul Graffey-Smith to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received March 20.)

(No. 19. Secret.)

Jeddah, March 10, 1922

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith the Jeddah report for the period the 1st to 10th March, 1922.

Copies of this report and despatch have been sent to Cairo, Bagdad, Jerusalem, Ahen, Dela and Transjordan.

I have, &c

L. B. GRAFFEY-SMITH

Enclosure in No. 184.

Jeddah Report for the Period March 1-10, 1922.

(Secret.)

KING HUSSEIN returned suddenly to Mecca on the 2nd March in order to compose the differences of the Beni Zaid and the Beni Saleim, two sub-tribes of the Masruhi, whom he had summoned to Mecca to meet him. He was accompanied by the

[8975]

B M

No. 565 opens with the following official proclamation:

No. 566 also publishes a proclamation reminding the public of the prohibition of the export of gold.

[illegible]

123

In the communication of the 29th December, 1921, your Lordship drew particular attention to the situation in Palestine. A state of peace between the Allied Powers and Turkey does not yet exist. Nevertheless, the United States appreciates the desire of His Majesty's Government to remove the existing uncertainties regarding the terms of the mandate for Palestine in order that a legalised civil administration may be

ation is taken by an abstemious and is not to

be responsible for securing the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine in accordance with the provisions of article 15, as follows:

The mandatory will see that complete freedom of conscience and the free exercise of all forms of worship, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, is ensured to all. No discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Palestine on the ground of race, religion or language. No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of his religious belief. . . .

And also the following provision of article 16:

For the maintenance of public order and good government. Subject to such supervision no measures shall be taken in Palestine to obstruct or interfere with the enterprise of such bodies, or to discriminate against any representative or member of them on the ground of his religion or nationality."

Also that the mandatory accepts "all responsibility in connection with the holy places and religious buildings or sites in Palestine, including that of preserving existing rights, or securing free access to the holy places, religious buildings and sites and the free exercise of worship, while ensuring the requirements of public order and law."

In addition, my Government has noted the statement of your Lordship that the

right to acquire and possess property, to erect buildings for religious purposes and to open schools, providing that they conform to the local law."

My Government is satisfied with these stipulations and assurances on the assumption, as already stated, that there will be a general provision in the proposed treaty giving to the United States the benefits, rights and privileges which under the mandate, are to accrue to the States which are members of the League of Nations.

4. *Modification of Mandate.*—My Government has observed the statement of your Lordship in your note of the 21st December to which you refer in your note of the 25th December, that it would be difficult to insert in the mandate itself a provision that the consent of the United States should be obtained before any alteration is made in the text of the mandate. My Government does not believe such an insertion to be necessary, in view of the fact, to which your Lordship adverts, that there is "nothing

in making may be embodied in the proposed treaty. It would not, however, be deemed by my Government to be sufficient to provide merely for consultation with the United States.

5. As His Majesty's Government is aware, the Japanese Government has agreed with the League of Nations on the administration of mandate territories. A provision to this effect is incorporated in the treaty between the United States and Japan relating to the mandated islands in the Pacific north of the Equator, and it is desired that a similar provision should be included in the treaty relating to the mandate for Palestine.

6. My Government assumes that any provisions which may be agreed upon as necessary to safeguard the rights and interests of the United States will apply to the territories mentioned in article 25 of the mandate.

If His Majesty's Government is willing to meet the wishes of the United States with reference to the matters upon which concurrence has not already been indicated, the Government of the United States is prepared to enter immediately upon the negotiation of the necessary treaty.

In conclusion, I beg to convey additional information regarding the Philippine Petroleum Act, which was referred to in your Lordship's note of the 28th February, 1921, and in my memorandum of the 24th August, 1921. The Governor-General of the Philippines has reported that the Act was amended at the last session of the

Philippine Legislature, which was passed on the 15th March, 1922, and which is in accordance with the provisions of the Act of March 15, 1922, No. 184.

E 3737 65 65]

No. 186

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Count de Salis (Vienna).

(No. 91.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, April 8, 1922.

THE Colonial Office have received a letter from Dr. Weizmann stating that, in

suspects that this document refers to, and probably protests against, terms of articles 2, 4 and 14.

3. I request you to report by telegraph whether you have any knowledge of the despatch of such a memorandum.

I am, &c.

CURZON OF KEDLESTON

E 3724 248 91]

No. 187

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Major Marshall (Iddich).

(No. 13.)

(Telegraphic.) R.

Foreign Office, April 13, 1922.

MR. GRAFFTEY-SMITH'S telegram No. 24 of 29th March: Hadjass Treaty

You are authorised to suggest the suppression, by an amending protocol, of certain of securing Hussein's ratification of treaty and the protocol amending it.

E 4020 248 91]

No. 188

Colonial Office to Foreign Office. (Received April 14.)

Sir,

Downing Street, April 13, 1922.

I AM directed by Mr. Secretary Churchill to refer to the Colonial Office letter of the 10th April, enclosing a copy of Bagdad telegram No. 283, and to inform you that he would be glad to learn the views of the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston as to the pilgrimage from Nejd to Mecca during the coming season.

2. Subject to any observations which Lord Curzon may have to make, Mr. Churchill is disposed to take the view that the total exclusion of Nejd pilgrims from Mecca for a fourth year is out of the question, and that the suggestion in the final sentence of the High Commissioner's telegram is the only possible compromise in the present difficulty.

I am, &c.

E. SHUCKBURY.

E 4091 65 65]

No. 189

Count de Salis to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received April 19.)

(No. 25.)

My Lord,

Rome, April 13, 1922.

DR. WEIZMANN, the head of the Zionist movement, called on me on the 29th March last, and at his request I arranged with the Cardinal Secretary of State for an interview, which took place on the following Sunday, the 2nd April. At

Dr Weizmann spoke to me of the hostility to his schemes which he anticipated he might encounter at the Vatican. I replied that, as far as I could see, it would never be easy to induce the Holy See to have much liking for the Zionist policy; it might,

13th June, 1921, and I accordingly gave Dr Weizmann a copy of our English translation, he might find it useful to look at the paper before seeing the cardinal, who would probably refer to points mentioned in it, he would see how far it was possible to remove misconceptions.

Dr. Weizmann subsequently left for Naples. He was anxious to see the Pope himself, and inclined to think that failure to arrange for an audience for him would be a mark of hostility on the Pope's part. For my part, I have spoken twice to the Cardinal Secretary of State. It is possible that an audience may be arranged for on Dr Weizmann's passing through Rome on his return to England; in any case, he is to see Cardinal Gasparri again.

As mentioned above, the views of the late Pope were defined in an allocution, copy of which was sent to your Lordship in my despatch No. 65 of the 29th June, while a summary of it will be found in my telegram No. 18 of the 14th June. These views are still, I think, held at the Vatican, while for some weeks past I understand that a memorandum has been under consideration, summing up the criticisms of the Holy See on the draft mandate presented by Sir A. Balfour to the League of Nations on the 7th December, 1920. This paper, which has been subject to revision before being approved by the Pope, has now been communicated, and I have the honour to transmit herewith a translation. It may be that this is the memorandum referred to in your despatch No. 90 of the 8th April, but I cannot for the moment say whether it has also been communicated to the Council of the League of Nations. On this point I will inform myself, if possible, and telegraph to your Lordship as desired, there may be a little delay owing to this being the end of July week.

As your Lordship will observe, the memorandum sets out at length the criticisms of the Vatican on the draft text of the mandate. The Holy See, it states, is not opposed to the grant to the Jews of civil rights equal to those of other nationalities, but cannot agree to their having a privileged and preponderant position, or that the rights of Christian confessions should not be sufficiently protected. In support of the first point, reference is made to the text of various articles of the draft and to a lecture given by Dr Weizmann on the 4th April at the Collegio Romano, in accordance with which, according to the memorandum, the programme of Zionism tends to the form of a Jewish State in Palestine, liberal, as far as desired, towards other nationalities and confessions, but sovereign in its own territory.

As regards the second point, particular attention is directed to article 14, which concerns the Holy Places. The Cardinal Secretary of State deals with the objections which the Holy See feel to the article in its present form. I had not had this paper when I saw Dr Weizmann, but, as I remarked to him when he alluded to article 14, the interests of Zionism would not, in this particular, appear to be directly concerned.

I have, &c.

J. DE SALIS

Enclosure in No. 189.

Cardinal Gasparri to Count de Salis.

(Translation.)

Dal Vaticano, March 6, 1922.

THE undersigned Cardinal Secretary of State of His Holiness has the honour to lay before your Excellency the following observations on the draft British mandate for Palestine which Mr. Balfour presented to the secretary-general of the League of Nations on the 7th December, 1920—

The Holy See does not oppose the acquisition by Jews in Palestine of equal civil rights as are enjoyed by other nationalities and confessions, but it cannot consent—

1. That the Jews should have given them a privileged and preponderant position over other nationalities and confessions.
2. That the rights of Christian confessions should not be adequately safeguarded.

As regards the first point, although the draft in its preliminary considerations

rien ne pourrît être fait qui pût porter préjudice aux droits civils et religieux des communautés non juives existant en Palestine," in the actual articles it establishes an absolute economic, administrative and political preponderance of Jews over other nationalities.

In the articles of the draft—

(a.) Recognition as a public body is given to a Jewish commission which is no other than the powerful Zionist organisation (article 4).

A Jewish commission is placed alongside of the Palestine Administration and has been given a powerful voice in even all questions relative to the développement du pays.

It is provided for the Jews in regard to immigration, naturalisation (article 7), a close settlement is to be provided for them on the land, including State lands and waste lands (article 6). They are given a privileged position with regard to the construction of public works (article 11).

Looking at the absolute preponderance of Jews not only seriously damaging to the rights of other nationalities, but also to the rights of the Jewish community itself, the Treaty of Versailles, which establishes the idea and aim of each mandate. Indeed, according to the above-mentioned article, the mandate is a tutelage which one Power assumes of peoples who are not "encore capables de se diriger eux-mêmes dans les conditions d'une société de civilisation," that is, "to bring about the development of these peoples."

A mandate would be contrary to all of this were it the instrument for subordinating native populations to the advantage of other nationalities. And indeed, while Dr. Weizmann assured the undersigned cardinal that Zionism did not have, and did not wish to have a privileged and superior position in Palestine over other nationalities or religious confessions, at his conference of the 4th April at the Collegio Romano he expounded the Zionist programme as aiming at the constitution of a real Jewish State in Palestine, as liberal as could be desired towards other nationalities and confessions, but sovereign in its own territory.

As regards the second point, particular attention is given to article 14 of the

"une commission spéciale pour étudier et régler toutes les questions relatives aux différentes confessions religieuses." As regards this commission (which is to be appointed by England, but with a president chosen by the Council of the League of Nations) it is not stated in the draft how many members it is to consist of, but all religions whose interests are in discussion are to be represented on it—in what proportion is not mentioned. The Holy See, as is evident, cannot agree that Catholic interests should be dealt with by representatives chosen, not by the competent hierarchy, but by laymen.

It is further stated in the draft that "les lieux saints, bâtiments ou sites religieux considérés comme appartenant à une religion particulière, soient confiés à un contrôle permanent de corps appropriés, représentant les adhérents de la religion en question."

Owing to their vagueness, the terms of this article, as it reads, are such as to give rise to the impression that the representatives of the several religious confessions are to be even.

of what will be done regarding those places which are regarded with special veneration by the adherents of different religions (i.e., Catholics and Mohammedans).

Dealing in this case with sanctuaries which concern several confessions, it is only too probable that in the commission itself, composed of representatives of all religions, the interests of the confessions which are in the possession of the sanctuary in question, thus hindering any possibility of calm judgment.

Finally, it is to be observed that in the terms of the mandate "le choix des membres de la commission, assujéti à l'approbation du mandataire." This last clause, as is evident, gives to England an excessive power, without mentioning that it seems to be contrary to article 95 of the Treaty of Sévres. In conformity with the above, it seems

that some modifications, as your Excellency will realise, are necessary in the text of the mandate.

The undersigned cardinal has the honour to bring the foregoing to the knowledge of your Excellency and avails himself, &c.,

P. CARD. GASPARRI.

E 4085 656 91]

No. 190

Acting Consul Graffley-Smith to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received April 19)

Jeddah, March 31, 1922

I HAVE the honour to transmit to you herewith the Jeddah report for the period 11th 31st March, 1922.

Copies of this despatch and report are being sent to Cairo, Bagdad, Jerusalem, Aden, Delhi and Transjordan.

I have, &c.

L. B. GRAFFLEY-SMITH.

Enclosure in No. 190

Jeddah Report for the period March 11 31, 1922

Mr. Jacobson, accompanied by several family members, arrived on 11th March. The Emir Zeid followed his father to Jeddah on the 14th March.

which he had picked up on the road from Mecca, he was, as always when he manages to keep off politics, a glib and charming host.

On the 15th March, however, his charm evaporated in the heat of argument. For two and a half hours he recited his love for Great Britain, adding that he was now

Britain were, as they had ever been, precisely reciprocated. I doubt if it held much of consolation for him.

He said that he was tortured by the fear that Great Britain believed him to be

rested, with a magnificent gesture, "Am I a foreigner? Is Abdullah a foreigner?"

which his signature alone was lacking. He said that he had not meant a tumble-

On the following day, King Hussein called at this agency. He was in a state of

to the consulate and had heard M. Van de Plas on the subject of quarantine—and his

and there was no use to take his place, for no one had his capacity for government,

the other hand, how could he remain, feeling himself estranged from Great Britain? He was very bitter and very eloquent.

He was by turns erudite and witty, and we read together from "Anwar-ul-Rab" a collection of Arabic metaphors, *jeux de mots* and other stylistic refinements. He was particularly pleased with a quatrain upon which I stumbled, in which the poet states that Allah, when anxious to exalt a virtuous man, raises up tongues of envy against him. King Hussein, much gratified, took this as of personal application, and in the ensuing number of "Al Qibla" this verse was made the text of a eulogy on Hussein ibn Ali contributed by the inevitable "Hender in Jeddah."

On the 16th March, the King and his party returned to Mecca. As on the occasion of his last visit, the foreign representatives were not previously notified of the date or hour of His Majesty's departure.

The tone of King Hussein's conversations in Jeddah and of his official correspondence during the period under review suggests that he has stiffened against us, and that any expectation of a gesture on his part towards compromise is, as has been every past hope of his reasonable behaviour, premature. The tone of letters received from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs is generally a reliable indication of the warmth of the King's sentiments, since he personally dictates all correspondence. These letters have recently been of an insolence barely tolerable: they might have been written by a spiteful child.

The apparent lack of any material advantage in his stock and the contrast of Italian eagerness to help him to aeroplanes, have also irritated him, and it is difficult to imagine anything better calculated to

ignoring arriving by ships on more days. The ships leave in quarantine or not, according to the inspiration of Thabet Bey's caprice.

Pilgrims have been incited by the Director-General of Quarantine to claim from their consular authorities a refund of the 8 rupees at present charged for kamuran quarantine dues, on the ground that the pilgrims of a clean ship get no value for their

The King has ordered Javanom mutawwif in Mecca to obtain signatures of Javanom pilgrims to a document belauding the Hedjaz quarantine and other pilgrimage arrangements.

The suggestion has been made to me more than once lately, notably by Emir Zeid, that an Arab doctor should be allowed to watch Hedjaz quarantine interests at Kamuran. If there were such a person as an Arab doctor, he might usefully be employed in the quarantine office in Jeddah.

The Dutch consul has been zealous Thabet Bey, hitherto without much

allure, all except the Hedjaz are out of step.

be made to him by Messrs. Holt's agent before clearance is given to the ships, I have formally guaranteed this agent's ability to pay, and have demanded that no ship be

d for reasons connected with the payment of dues after it Thabet Bey the usual bill on the agent.

Palestine Wafd in London.

King Hussein telegraphed 2,000 L. to the Palestine Arab delegation in London and the end of February. His Majesty to send one of his sons to London, personally to support the

[Faint bleed-through from the reverse side of the page]

I do not yet know what price is being paid, nor what arrangements will be made for manning or for docking these vessels. Rushdy Bey informs me that they will be primarily used by His Majesty, not for commercial exploitation, but for carrying arms and machine guns. They probably will: not only, as Rushdy Bey presumably intended, by way of equipment as coastal patrol boats, but as cargo from Massawa.

The company "Marittima Italiana," hitherto represented in Jeddah by Messrs. Haji Zeinal Ali Riza, have now an Italian agent named Meh, an employee of their Suva agents, Messrs. G. Lazzarini and Co., M. Lazzarini himself has been the last three weeks in Jeddah.

Aviation

views, not alone boasting that the Italian Government have recently sent 15,000 rifles

and material in the Hijaz by Italian pilots and mechanics, and Italian machines. The Italian consul is reported to have arranged with his Government to send to Jeddah, presumably via Massawa, a fighting aeroplane, machine guns, bombs and an

for whom the Hashimite Government have repeatedly telegraphed, is not likely to return to the Hejaz, as he has signed a contract to fly to Japan.

Italian enterprise has local supporters. Rashid Bey, Constantin Yanko and the Director-General of Customs are all believed to have a financial interest, according to them by M. Pastori and M. Lazzarini, in the purchase of Italian air material.

premonition is that the Italian consul, a once cheerful little Neapolitan doctor has been rather rushed off his feet by this concentration of national high politics high finance. But he is indubitably popular with the Majesty in consequence. Locally he is even said to have promised King Hussein protection against Ibn Sa'ud in case of need, and as many Italian Moslem troops from Ferrara as the King may desire.

The pilot Stavris has made three attempts to fly to Afsan, on the Mecca Rabegh road, where he is required to produce a moral effect upon the tribes through whose territory the Mecca-Medina caravan must pass. The only Caudron machine available is, however, still too defective for a successful flight.

Siavri has recently been ordered to fly via Rabegh and Yembo to Medina, to place himself there at the disposal of the Emir Ali.

A Farnan machine has been packed and is being sent by sambuk to Yombu, where a new Russian mechanic has arrived from Cairo. M. Maximof has been offered his own terms to go to Medina to keep in repair the machines which Stavris is to fly. He is not likely to accept.

Verf. d. H.

All arrivals from Medina are unanimous in their reports of the rapid spread of the Saudi and pro-Wahhabi doctrines around Medina. Tribe after tribe declares for the Saudis.

Sheikh Abdullah Abu Rub, Sheikh of the Sahlyyeh Araf, a section of the Maanib

tribe against Wahabian encroachments. He was informed that if he and his tribe came to come within the walls of Medina they would receive protection. A similar request made to Aliud-jbn Mansur, the sub-governor, met with a similar reply. Sheekh Abdullab Abu Rub thereupon took his followers to the camp of the Emir Ali's own camel corps, outside Medina town, looted it of camels and arms, and made off into the desert.

The matter may have serious consequences, for the prescribed route for the caravan is by the Red Sea, and Bir-*al-Mashi*, and practically the whole of this coast from Rabeigh to Medina is in Maghreb country. The first trade caravan to pass after the incident, one of 300 camels, was plundered by Sheikh *Abdullah* Abu *Rub*'s people.

Sheikh Foad al-Khatib informed me on the 17th March that Ah had wired to his father to say that he could accept no responsibility for the security of this year's Medina pilgrimage.

Polymer.

of the

TABLE 1. *Continued*

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 2680, 26

1. The first group of people who are likely to be affected by the proposed project are the local residents who live in the vicinity of the project site. These residents may be affected by the project in a number of ways, including increased traffic, noise, and air pollution. It is important to identify these potential impacts and develop measures to mitigate them.

Other means of entering

The Government of India have notified me that they are not disposed to issue upon return tickets for Indian pilgrims, owing to the attitude of Moslem members of the Indian legislature.

It is profoundly discouraging to think that, despite the restored representations of the Hestias, in contravention of Koranic injunction and, apparently, for the personal satisfaction of various Modern gentlemen on Hay committees and other bodies whose responsibility appears not to extend to the combating or obviation of this nuisance, but to cease with its initiation. Indian politicians may in any case be accused of regarding as being subjects of a Government which has officially recommended the return of the holy places to Turkish suzerainty.

Slack Tents

There has been for some little time no Red Sea patrol sloop in the Red Sea. H.M.S. "Cornflower" is resting at Malta, and H.M.S. "Clematis" has taken Zaghiel Paika to the Seychelles. The opportunity has been well exploited by slave traders, the large stocks which had accumulated at Mide must have been almost all liquidated by now. The market in Mecca is better than that in Jeddah, and many children are being sent for sale there.

General

(a.) Amin Rihani, the King's Syrian-American guest, left for Port Sudan en route for Aden, on the 15th instant. He was accompanied by Constantine

(b.) The King has instructed the Arab agent in Cairo to apply to the Egyptian Government for recognition as a diplomatic agent.

(c.) The Hashimite Government have informed me of a recent conflict on the Asir-Hedjaz border between local tribesmen and Wahhabis, whose object is alleged to have been to cut off supplies of sheep and of gum from Mecca. A fortnight has elapsed since I received this notification, but there has been no confirmatory Jeddah or Mecca rumour. There was, indeed, a sudden and serious shortage of meat in Mecca during the week ending the 26th March, but supplies are now normal again.

Wahhabi aggression is a normal feature of life on the Asir-Hedjaz marches, but if an effort to cut off sheep supplies from the south were to be successful the situation in Mecca would soon be precarious. I do not think the town could dispense with the and Nejd is no longer a popular source of supply.

(d.) The French representative left Jeddah for Medina, via Yumbo, on the 22nd March. He is expected to return by the Khedivial mail steamer arriving at Jeddah on the 5th April.

(e.) Major Marshall, M.C., R.A.M.C., His Majesty's agent and consul, probably returns on the same day from leave of absence in the United Kingdom.

Press ("Al Qibla")

No. 567 contains, besides a long commentary on a "Mogattam" article about the Wahhabis, the following official notification:—

"For the information of the inhabitants of the country and to enable them to appreciate the real value of news diffused by telegraph agencies and by many sections of the press about our country, and to judge of the degree of falsehood in such communications, the Government publishes the following telegram from the Arab agent in Egypt:—

"Have been circulated a very mischievous communiqué, referring to a fight at the doors of the Haram, the imposition of a tax on the dead and the conscription of pilgrims. Reuter's confirms this. I have issued a categorical denial."

"(Note by the Editor.—It is known to us and to the whole world that the people of Great Britain are famed for their aversion from falsehood. We are unable to account for the tenacity of Reuter's in traversing the truth.)"

Thus in a stone in my garden, since foreign representatives are always held responsible by King Hussein for whatever news about the Hedjaz appears in their national press. The imposition of a burial tax and the conscription of pilgrims are, of course, facts. These denials are for the benefit of readers abroad; they carry no conviction to readers in the Hedjaz.]

No. 568 announces the decoration of Dr. Mohammed Hussam, Acting Director-General of the "Public Health Department" with the Order of Al Iqbal, 3rd Class.

This is one of the two Hussam brothers who were prominent during the quarantine days of 1920.]

The change in the Hashimite flag is brought to public notice.

The greater part of this number is taken up with comments on articles published by "Al" on the strength of the King's publication of an article from an imaginary treaty enquires whether the Hedjaz is under British protection, and states that King Hussein considers himself as a British official.

The King replies by publishing—not for the first time—his letter

A Parliamentary question, in reply to which Mr. Churchill is reported to

King Hussein gives Mr. Churchill the lie straight in the face

It is only fair to King Hussein to say that, if as is presumably the case, the sum in question was voted for him but has been spent, the King Hussein has never been informed that his son's and other people's expenses were being debited to his new "subsidy account."

The "Bourse Egyptienne" version of the reply to Mr. Lamberti's question is that King Hussein stood to receive a grant of 1,400,000 F. francs a month from August 1921; this brought the French representative round to this agency in a hurry.]

No. 569 publishes the thoughts inspired in "a Reader in Jeddah"

the same number reproduces an article from No. 504 of "La Argentina"

No. 570 announces the departure of the first Medina pilgrim-caravan for the 23rd March.

It did not, in fact, leave until the 26th March.]

No. 571 discusses the declaration of Egypt

No. 572 reprints an article from No. 323 of "Al Qibla" of the 27th September, in response to whose urgent request this article is said to be reproduced are intended that, while King Hussein will not share the responsibility of the

L. B. GRAFLEY-SMITH

Shipping Intelligence

Ship	Company	Agent	Destination	Departure	Arrival
Al-Bahar	British India	British India	Aden	15/3	16/3
Al-Bahar	British India	British India	Aden	16/3	17/3
Al-Bahar	British India	British India	Aden	17/3	18/3
Al-Bahar	British India	British India	Aden	18/3	19/3
Al-Bahar	British India	British India	Aden	19/3	20/3
Al-Bahar	British India	British India	Aden	20/3	21/3
Al-Bahar	British India	British India	Aden	21/3	22/3
Al-Bahar	British India	British India	Aden	22/3	23/3
Al-Bahar	British India	British India	Aden	23/3	24/3
Al-Bahar	British India	British India	Aden	24/3	25/3

[E 4127/65 65]

No. 191

Count de Salis to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received April 19.)

[By Bag.]

N. (caption) R.

Vatican, April 15, 1922

YOUR despatch No. 90 and my despatch No. 58 of 13th April
Note has not been sent to League of Nations.

E 4201 274 69]

No. 192

Consul-General Satow to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. (Received April 22)

N. (caption) R.

Beirut, April 11, 1922.

11th April Amal Bey.

political one. Two persons have been arrested. Among these are Araf Dervish, who certain other individuals have also been arrested. Whether these arrests are in connection with the murder of Amal Bey or with the recent demonstrations in Damascus I cannot say, but it looks as though the authorities were concerned with a Moslem movement and in this case there may be truth in the story that at a meeting at the house of Dervish Khazari on the day before the murder it was decided to regard as infidels all Moslems in French service. The murder of Amal Bey may have been meant as a warning.

In any case, the note regarding the new Lebanon despatch No. 40 of the 11th April.

marks a beginning of a new relation of Christians and Moslems their views and to obtain his views, the result of whose visit to Mr. Curzon, No. 101, should be in Beirut at the same time.

If the Moslems are really at the bottom of the trouble they have doubtless been encouraged, both by the Angora Agreement and its sequel, including the visit of Bekir Sami Bey, and by the French and that they need not lose their feelings regarding them, but the prompt measures taken at Damascus will no doubt have a salutary effect here. I believe that the murderer of Amal Bey will in due course be hanged.

I have, Sir,
H. E. SATOW.

E 4398 248 91]

No. 193

Sir P. Cox to Mr. Churchill. (Communicated by Colonial Office, April 28.)

(No. 319)

(Telegraphic)

April 28, 1922

In a letter received to-day, Ibn Saud says that to prevent his subjects from deserting to the British he will be a constant part of the British forces. He says that he will be a constant part of the British forces.

I should be glad to be furnished at an early date with material for reply to Ibn Saud.

E 4409 248 91]

No. 194

Major Marshall to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston (Received April 29)

(No. 29)

(Telegraphic)

Jeddah April 29, 1922

King Hussein takes same position as last year. He says they may come to an agreement with the British Government.

E 4577 78 65

No. 195

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Mr. Harvey.

Your Excellency,

Foreign Office, April 29, 1922

His Majesty's Government have had under careful consideration the note which you were good enough to submit to me on the 27th inst. and I desire to inform you that the Government of the United States have agreed that, in so far as the United States are concerned, the only suspension during the present crisis of the United States, on the termination of the present crisis, the authorities concerned should be made to safeguard the interests in judicial matters of foreigners whose rights are affected by the present crisis. It is the policy of the United States that the United States do not intend to take any action which would be to leave the United States in a position of disadvantage.

It is the policy of the United States that the United States do not intend to take any action which would be to leave the United States in a position of disadvantage. It is the policy of the United States that the United States do not intend to take any action which would be to leave the United States in a position of disadvantage.

guarantee of the League, that the Government of Palestine will fully honour the financial obligations legitimately incurred by the Administration of Palestine during the period of the mandate, including the rights of public servants to pensions or gratuities.

This alteration would not, if the course suggested in paragraph 4 is adopted, affect the arrangements on the termination of the mandate and the consequent revival of their capitulatory rights, but I should be glad to learn that your Excellency's Government would raise no objection to this amendment.

5. Inasmuch as the terms of the Palestine mandate are to be recited in the treaty, it is necessary that those terms should be definitely settled before the treaty can be negotiated and signed. His Majesty's Government are therefore extremely anxious to see the terms of the mandate settled at their meeting on the 11th May, even if the mandate cannot be actually issued at present, and for this purpose they desire, with the consent of the United States Government, to lay the correspondence between your Excellency and myself before the Council of the League, as showing that agreement between the two Governments has now been reached. I have therefore the honour to request the assent of the Government of the United States to this course being adopted, in which case the negotiations for the treaty will be entered into as soon as the terms of the mandate have been approved by the Council of the League.

6. Your Excellency will observe that the period before the meeting of the Council of the League on the proposals made in this note could be communicated to me at the earliest possible date.

I have, &c.
CURZON OF KEDLESTON

(E 4453 4453 91)

No. 196

Admiralty to Foreign Office.—(Received May 1.)

(Confidential.)

Sir,

Admiralty, April 28, 1922.

I AM commanded by my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to transmit herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, a copy of a submission of the 9th February from the commander-in-chief, Mediterranean, on the subject of the slave traffic in the Hedjaz.

2. I am to state that their Lordships concur in the remarks of the commander-in-chief.

3. A similar letter has been sent to the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies.

I am, &c.
CHARLES WALKER

Enclosure 1 in No. 196.

Commanding Officer, H.M.S. "Cornflower" at Port Soudan, to Commander-in-chief, Mediterranean Station.

(Confidential.)

REFERENCE my letter of the 5th December, 1921, and my signal 2324, 19, I enclose copies of two letters received from Jeddah—the former in answer to mine, and dated the 13th December, 1921, and received by me on arrival at Port Soudan on the 31st December, 1921, and the latter dated the 10th January, 1922, and received by me, approximately, 16th January, 1922.

2. In accordance with instructions received from the Senior Officer, Red Sea Patrol, I have been engaged in a cruise between Jeddah and Lath.

L. G. B. CAMPBELL.

The above is a true and correct copy of the letter received from Jeddah, and a true and correct copy of the letter received from the Senior Officer, Red Sea Patrol, and a true and correct copy of the letter received from the Senior Officer, Red Sea Patrol, and a true and correct copy of the letter received from the Senior Officer, Red Sea Patrol.

now for His Majesty's Government to show something more than the "official humanitarianism" of the Hashemite Government, of which the British agent speaks. It will only be to drive the traffic further underground. Such an argument for the suppression of the traffic is somewhat familiar. Whilst we have influence with King Hussein we should exert it unquestioningly to suppress a trade so iniquitous—to ignore it, when it is known by all, is to encourage it.

J. M. DE ROBERT, Admiral,
Commander-in-chief

"Iron Duke," February 9, 1922.

Enclosure 2 in No. 196.

Commander Campbell to Major Marshall (Jeddah).

H.M.S. "Cornflower" at Port Soudan,
December 5, 1921.

Sir,

I BEG to inform you that while at Jeddah my native interpreter got into conversation with a native in a café in the market, and, as a result, reported to me in the following terms:

"The day before yesterday, the 4th inst., two dhows arrived during the night full of slaves, and these were landed openly during the night, through the customs, and that the customs authorities in Jeddah levied revenue on the slaves generally. He was further told that, if he liked, he could go and see the open slave market in a house in Jeddah and observe the selling of slaves going on, and that any one who wished to buy slaves could go there and buy them."

He further informed me that the same day as "Cornflower" arrived at Jeddah (4th inst.) two dhows arrived during the night full of slaves, and these were landed openly during the night, through the customs, and that the customs authorities in Jeddah levied revenue on the slaves generally.

He was further told that, if he liked, he could go and see the open slave market in a house in Jeddah and observe the selling of slaves going on, and that any one who wished to buy slaves could go there and buy them."

There is no corroboration of this statement, but there certainly was a dhow which arrived at Jeddah on the 4th inst., and it is possible that it was carrying slaves in to cross the Red Sea direct, and then turn north or south across the Gulf of Aden to the coast of Arabia.

I forward you the above statement for your information and any action you may deem necessary.

I have, &c.
L. G. B. CAMPBELL.

Enclosure 3 in No. 196.

Major Marshall to Commander, H.M.S. "Cornflower," Port Soudan.

(Confidential.)

Sir,

Jeddah, December 13, 1921.

I BEG to acknowledge the receipt of your memorandum of the 5th instant on the subject of the slave traffic in the Hedjaz. The statement made by your informant is wrong in his statement that there is a market in Jeddah for the sale of slaves. The open slave market in Mecca—Dukka-el-Rakik—was closed about two years ago by order of King Hussein.

The vast majority of slaves imported into this country come from the Yemen, having been previously taken there from the African coast. On the occasion you mention about thirty slaves, mostly females, arrived in Jeddah from the Yemen. Customs officers have been told of these slaves.

These slaves can only be bought in the houses of certain dealers in Jeddah, to

whom they are consigned. The price is settled privately and there is no auction. The price of a slave is now about 60l., but one trained in household duties may be sold for as much as 100l.

I have, &c.
W. E. MARSHALL,
British Agent and Consul.

Enclosure 4 in No. 190

Vice-Consul Graftley-Smith to Commander, H.M.S. "Counforce," Port Sudan

(Confidential.)

Jeddah, January 10, 1922

With reference to this agency's despatch of the 13th December last, I have the honour to inform you that the following consignments of slaves have arrived in Jeddah from the 1st instant to date—

January 1: 37 children, aged 8-14 (12 girls and 25 boys).

January 2: 45 children, aged 8-11

January 4: 5 children, aged 8-14 (2 girls and 3 boys)

Other batches are expected.

Many of these children are stolen I understand, from the Moslem village of Antajbara in Abyssinia, which is mentioned as an important source of supply. They are taken by the raiders by camel to Obokh or Asah on the coast, whence they are shipped by sambuk across to Mudi in the Yemen, either after sale to the sambuk owner or under the escort of their original captors.

In the case of one consignment of the children who have recently arrived in Jeddah, ten men accompanied them across to Mudi and there delivered them to Syed Abdul Matloob, Shaikh of Mudi, who is by birth a native of Ru'ia, near Jeddah. Four of the men conducted them from Mudi to Jeddah, where, with the connivance of the local authorities, they were transhipped with a smaller sambuk and taken to

The attitude of the local authorities towards this traffic is peculiar. In previous years customs dues have been charged, in gold or in kind, an impost of 34l. gold per slave having recently caused the protests of the traders. But in the course of my recent review, I understand that the Government informed the traders officially that such traffic is illegal and that the slaves must be confiscated by the Government. They were, in fact, shepherded through the Jeddah Suq to the Khoub Baitun, where they were accommodated, by two Hashimite Government policemen. Official humanitarianism appears, however, to have been limited in this public announcement. The slaves are now on sale privately and unofficially by brokers, and the Government takes all the proceeds except an approximate 25 per cent. down, with which the traders seem to be content. Three girls, aged from 10 to 14, were purchased by the local cash for 35l. apiece, but prices are expected to drop to 20l.

I am credibly informed that 200 more slaves are awaiting transport to Jeddah at Mudi, which seems to be the most important distributing centre.

I have small hope of success attending these representations, the result of which may only be to drive the traffic further underground.

Copies of this despatch are being sent to the Senior Naval Officer, Red Sea and to the Governor, Khartoum.

I have, &c.
W. E. MARSHALL

[E 4545 65/65]

No. 197

Count de Sales to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 3.)

[By Bag.]

(No. 17.)

(Telegraphic) R.

Vatican, April 11, 1922

My immediately preceding telegram.

Cardinal Secretary of State has informed Mr. Dornier that a further note on mandate of Palestine is in course of preparation. It would make some constructive suggestions, especially as regards article 14. In reply to further enquiries he said that memorandum was being sent to League of Nations respecting this article.

E 4577 78 65,

No. 198

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to the British representatives at Paris (No. 160) and Rome (No. 136 (D)).

By Bag.

Foreign Office, May 4, 1922

Practical agreement having now been reached with United States Government, Majesty's Government propose to invite Council of League of Nations at their next meeting on 11th May definitely to approve terms of mandate, if they are not prepared to issue it at once, as treaty with United States Government regarding latter cannot be concluded until its final terms, which must be recited in treaty, are definitely known. Majesty's Government regard it as important that no

would therefore inform Government to which you are accredited that His Majesty's Government propose to raise question before Council on 11th May and that their representative may be instructed to support His British Majesty's Government such assistance as he can with a view to procure an early and satisfactory

E 4653 856 91

No. 199

Major Marshall to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 6.)

(No. 29. Secret.)

My Lord,

Jeddah, April 20, 1922

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith the Jeddah report for the period the

Copies of this report and despatch have been sent to Cairo, Bagdad, Jerusalem, Aden, Delhi, Transjordan and Damascus.

I have, &c.

W. E. MARSHALL, Major, R.A.M.C.,
British Agent and Consul

Enclosure in No. 199

Jeddah Report, April 1 to 20, 1922

(Secret.)

Pilgrimage.

THE total number of pilgrims now in the Hedjaz is approximately 18,400. All are expected to leave for Mecca on the 22nd instant, and is expected to arrive at Jeddah on the 22nd instant.

In spite of Emir Ali's telegram to his father that he would not be responsible for

the safety of pilgrims going to Medina, three caravans, comprising from 5,000 to 6,000 pilgrims, left Mecca for Medina. The first caravan arrived safely on the 9th April. It is said that Emir Ali has come to terms with the chief of the Ahanda tribe and with Sheikh Abdullah Abu Raba of the Sahlyyah Auf section of the Masruh tribe and that both roads to Medina, via Rabegh, are open. It is rumoured, on the other hand, that the pilgrim caravans went by another route, still farther east, which is not much frequented. We shall be able to find out the true state of affairs when the first caravan has reached Rabegh on the return journey, reaches Mecca.

We are having the usual difficulty this year over quarantine. Kamuran quarantine is ignored, and all the pilgrims are being sent to the quarantine islands for twenty-four hours. Not only so, but the ships themselves are being kept in quarantine, and the agent, pilot and coolies treated accordingly. The Dutch consul and I have protested strongly against this, and Dr Thabet, the quarantine doctor, in a reply to the Dutch consul, said he could not accept the word of any ship's doctor as to the presence of any infectious disease on board. I understand that King Hussein has wired to ask the committee of the League of Nations, which recently visited Alexandria and Constantinople to discuss the International Quarantine Convention, to visit Jeddah. Perhaps, if they accept, they will be able to convince the King of the folly of his quarantine arrangements and hasten the downfall of Dr. Thabet, an event which would be welcomed by all the foreign representatives and shipping agents.

Hedjaz Shipping

Mohammed Tawil, Director of Customs, and Ibrahim Bey, Commandant of Jeddah, left for Massawa on the 10th April to arrange for the purchase of two steamers for the Red Sea. The "Paolo" and the "Mascotto," which were both doing coastal work in the Red Sea during the summer of 1921. The latter boat has a condensing plant. Both boats are small.

With reference to the purchase of these steamers an official proclamation appeared in "Al Qibla," No. 577, to the effect that the Hashimite Government are making arrangements for the transport of Syrian, Transjordanian and Palestinian pilgrims from Maan to Akaba by motor-orry, and from Akaba to Jeddah by steamer. So far I have no knowledge of the purchase of the motor-lorries required for this purpose, but in his despatch No. 103 of the 31st December, 1921, Mr. Graffey-Smith mentioned that the Italian Pastor had talked of motor transport concessions between Akaba and Maan.

I have informed the Egyptian and Palestinian authorities of the possibility of pilgrims returning by this route, so that if it actually comes to pass arrangements may be made for the quarantine of these returning pilgrims.

Aviation.

M. Mazimof's contract expired on the 31st March. Great pressure was brought to bear upon him and upon M. Stavris to induce them to go to Medina. Stavris was to fly via Akaba and Rabegh when M. Mazimof was to go by sea. The Government, by taking petrol to Rabegh in preparation for this flight had an engagement with the British Government. The notorious lack of public security in the district over which he was expected to fly, did much to deter Stavris from accepting the mission offered to him. Mazimof also refused, as he was unwilling to renew his contract. After considerable discussion, these two and Delicata, the Italian mechanic, signed a declaration to the effect that they would continue to work on condition that their employment was specifically limited to Jeddah only. The King thereupon closed the aerodrome.

Mazimof left on the 12th without receiving either his pay for the four days' work done after the expiration of his contract or his return fare to Egypt. Delicata has established himself in the Italian consulate and Stavris in the French consulate. A new Russian mechanic, named Klitsensky, arrived from Cairo on the 8th. I understand that he is not very competent.

General

a.) Dr. Najj-al-Assil Bey, a Mesopotamian, came to see me on the 12th April. He is the representative of the Anglo-French Middle East Development Corporation.

He said that the Foreign Office knew the purport of his visit to Mecca. I understand that King Hussein has signed an agreement with him for various projects in the Hedjaz.

(b.) The Frenchman named Victor Cherreau, alias Hassan Ahmed, mentioned in my report of the 1st April, is still in Mecca. He is a Frenchman of the Hedjaz, and is a member of the French Consulate. He is a Frenchman of the Hedjaz, and is a member of the French Consulate.

c.) On the 9th April there was a deliberate attack on the French Consulate. The French Consul, M. de la Roche, was injured. The French Consul, M. de la Roche, was injured.

d.) Small-pox is still present in Mecca, and I have been informed that the officer in charge of the depot has been taken to Mecca. Sabri Pasha, the Minister of War, came to Jeddah to investigate the matter.

(f.) Small-pox is still present in Mecca, and I have been informed that the officer in charge of the depot has been taken to Mecca. Sabri Pasha, the Minister of War, came to Jeddah to investigate the matter. No. 12 was, I think, influenza, which has been prevalent in Mecca. The epidemic has been reported to be of a very serious nature. It is rumoured that about three weeks ago 300 Bedouins went to Tadmor, where they surrounded the mosque at the time of the midday prayer, and killed all the men inside.

("Al Qibla").

No. 573 contains a reply, in the form of a firman by King Hussein, to criticisms of himself contained by "Al Mesbat" of the 1st April, 1922, with particular reference to his alleged Caliphate ambitions and to his subsidy during the war.

He asks how a man who has so often expressed his loyalty to the British Government can be accused with any worthy ambition. He quotes again extracts from his letter of the 21st Zil Q'ida, 1338, to Sir H. McMahon.

He thinks it ungrateful now to suggest that the aid rendered by him was overpaid.

The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King.

The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King. The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King.

The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King. The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King.

The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King. The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King.

The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King. The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King.

The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King. The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King.

The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King. The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King.

The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King. The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King.

The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King. The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King.

The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King. The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King.

The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King. The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King.

The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King. The editor of "Al Mesbat" published in "Al Mesbat" at Jeddah, a reply to the firman of the King.

SEE ALSO: *ENTREPRENEUR*

[illegible]

2441

14. *Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Count de Salm (Vatican)*

(No. 11.)

(Telegraphie) It

Foreign Office, May 8, 1922.

YOUR telegram No. 17 of 21st April, received 3rd May: Cardinal Secretary of State's intention of taking further action regarding British mandate for Palestine.

I am at a loss to understand in what manner Vatican can regard itself as being entitled to intervene in the matter in this way, except in so far as it may reasonably

Government are being commissioned by the Powers and the League of Nations to carry out in Palestine.

statement in the above paper

E 4800 274 69

No. 201

Consul-General Sidor to the Maritime Customs of Kadaton - (Received May 9.)

11. 12. 13.

WITH reference to your despatch No. 41 of the 15th March, instructing me to ascertain whether any of the French authorities in Syria were feeling that it had become necessary to take up the matter, and that they were awaiting the arrival of General Gouraud. The latter returned on the 23rd, and some days after his arrival I learned that the authorities were awaiting the arrival of General Gouraud. I am, therefore, in a position to report that the authorities in Syria are awaiting the arrival of General Gouraud.

With regard to the second paragraph of your despatch, it will perhaps be most convenient to take the various States in order, and explain what the position is in each of them.

Grand Liban.

There has usual recently been a nominated administrative council. Some weeks ago it was dissolved, and it is to be replaced shortly by an elected body, to be known as the representative council (see my despatch No. 46 of the 24th March). There is much dissatisfaction as to the limited powers to be given to the council.

The Governor of the State is a French naval officer, Commandant Traubert, who, during the war, was Governor of the Island of Round. He also acts as the delegate of the High Commissioner. The secretary-general Auguste Pasha Adib, a Lebanese, an amiable person, is in the Egyptian service and who, before his departure, was in the Egyptian service. There is a French Department of the Interior. There are other departments.

Each sajak has a native paltron. The sajak are divided into however, no French officials are attached. In given to the native officials, they are in practice tingly, to follow the wishes and advice of their advisers.

now been replaced by an elected council, which has not yet started work, the elections having only just finished.

Alameda Territory.

This district was until recent years almost entirely Turkish, the parts of which Turkish rule was less advanced than other parts of Syria. In the circumstances, the system of administration is necessarily more direct. The delegate of the High Commissioner, M. H. Billoze, who is also "conseiller du Gouvernement" and an assistant, and "conseillers" for Finance, Culture, Works, Agriculture, Health and Gendarmerie. There are two mukjiks, Lattakia and Tartous, each having a "conseiller administratif" and an assistant, while the municipality of Lattakia has also a "conseiller." There is no sort of council, either nominated or elected, at present.

Alpen.

The delegate is General Delamotte and the "conseiller du Gouvernement" is M Reclus. There are also a native Governor-General and native heads of Departments with French advisers attached. Full details are given in Mr. Morgan's despatch No. 306 of the 22nd April, of which a copy is enclosed. The real power at Aleppo is in the hands of the French delegate and advisers.

Alexandretta, one of the three sanjaks of the State of Aleppo, has under the Angora Agreement a special administrative autonomy. At present this seems to be nominal, and the only outward and visible sign thereof is the recognition of Turkish as an official language.

Детская

Particulars as to the system in force are given in Mr. Palmer's despatch No. 71 of the 18th April, of which a copy is enclosed. Here again the real power is in French hands. Both here and at Aleppo census operations have begun.

DANGER

$M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$

244

directors of Interior, Justice, Finance, Agriculture, &c., also nominated by the French. No administrative posts have been filled by Frenchmen, but a French adviser has been attached to each State and French advisers to each Department in the State, who exercise all power and authority and control the Government. Most of the French advisers to Aleppo State, such as those of Justice, Agriculture and Education, exercise the same functions in Alexandretta and Deir-es-Zor States, and, in a general way, these two States are subordinate to Aleppo, having the status of sanjaks, while Aleppo is considered a vilayet.

The members of the municipality are elected by the people and a French adviser is attached to it.

The native Governors and directors do not act independently from the French advisers.

Correspondence between all Departments and foreign authorities passes through the French adviser to the State.

It will be seen that the people of the three States have no voice in the Government, although they have in the municipalities. While they accepted this state of things in the beginning without murmuring, they are now becoming more bold in manifesting their discontent with the regime, and their discontent, in Aleppo at least, is increased by the fact that the native Governor-General has appointed a number of his relatives to various posts in the Administration, with the result that there is some resentment among those who have not succeeded in obtaining posts for themselves and their relatives.

It is no bad thing that the power is in the hands of the French civil and military authorities and of the High Commission. The people of Syria are not fit to stand alone as yet. Independence would mean Moslem supremacy, and I think that Moslems, whether brought up in the Turkish school or not, have yet to learn to govern with justice.

French authorities are somewhat inclined to truckle to the Moslems to keep them peaceful and win them over. This truckling weakens French influence among the Moslems. The latter show signs of being anti-French, are pro-British. They are in reality anti-European, and use the pro-British pose to try to get support for their anti-French sentiments.

The Capitulations are in force, but the native Moslem officials use the old Turkish methods to try and render them non-effective. In Aleppo their attitude in this respect upholds the Capitulations.

In general it may be said that the French have made no change from the former Ottoman system of administration, justice, commerce, &c.

Some natives have been accepted in volunteer levies, but military service is not compulsory.

I requested the vice consul in Alexandretta to give me a short report on conditions in his district, but have not received it. In these circumstances, perhaps the enclosed article from the "Syrie" of the 9th March, entitled "L'Autonomie du Sandjak d'Alexandrette et le libanement," may give an idea of conditions in that State.

I have, &c.

JAMES MORGAN

Enclosure 3 in No. 201

Excerpt from the "Syrie" of March 9, 1922

L'AUTONOMIE DU SANDJAK D'ALEXANDRETTE ET LE RENFÈLEMENT

VOUS est-il permis de demander quel doit être notre avenir administratif? Naturellement nous sommes soucieux de le savoir parce que nous nous trouvons à la veille des grands événements qui vont déterminer la forme définitive des Gouvernements au Liban et en Syrie: Les élections.

Alexandrette depuis son heureuse occupation fut l'objet d'une faveur spéciale de la part de la Puissance mandataire qui, tout en agrandissant son territoire, lui accorda l'autonomie administrative. Mais cette autonomie, proclamée devant les États syriens et reconnue à la Conférence de San-Remo et plus tard dans l'Accord d'Angora, ne fut malheureusement que nominale sans posséder les avantages réels, puisque le sandjak d'Alexandrette a toujours dépendu administrativement ou de Beyrouth ou d'Alep, et

dans certains cas de toutes les deux à la fois, c'est pourquoi on se demandait: la situation indéfinie doit-elle exister longtemps? Que signifie alors l'autonomie administrative? L'autonomie administrative, dans le sens de son étymologie, signifie le droit de se gouverner par ses propres lois. Mais l'autonomie administrative ne peut être que complète. Il n'existe pas dans la science politique d'autres termes ou définitions à l'autonomie. Nos dirigeants ne peuvent que reconnaître cette vérité: c'est pourquoi nous aimons attirer leur attention afin qu'ils s'empressent de mettre fin à la situation devenue gênante tant au point de vue administrative que social.

Notre attachement administratif à Alep ne peut nous être que préjudiciable: il place notre sandjak dans le second rang de préoccupation, il affaiblit les soins dans notre relèvement, et ce pour plusieurs raisons que nous nous contentons, pour le moment, d'en faire allusion seulement. Il est par conséquent plus profitable, du moment que nous possédons le privilège d'autonomie, de nous en faire pour compte.

Le régime spécial dont on a doté le sandjak d'Alexandrette à la suite de la Convention d'Angora, s'est vu induire par l'agrément de la langue turque comme langue officielle dans les différentes administrations. Le nombre des langues officielles ne peut être qu'un, et nous aurons prochainement parmi les langues officielles de nos administrations la langue arabe.

Le régime spécial dont on a doté le sandjak d'Alexandrette à la suite de la Convention d'Angora, s'est vu induire par l'agrément de la langue turque comme langue officielle dans les différentes administrations. Le nombre des langues officielles ne peut être qu'un, et nous aurons prochainement parmi les langues officielles de nos administrations la langue arabe.

Le régime spécial dont on a doté le sandjak d'Alexandrette à la suite de la Convention d'Angora, s'est vu induire par l'agrément de la langue turque comme langue officielle dans les différentes administrations. Le nombre des langues officielles ne peut être qu'un, et nous aurons prochainement parmi les langues officielles de nos administrations la langue arabe.

Le régime spécial dont on a doté le sandjak d'Alexandrette à la suite de la Convention d'Angora, s'est vu induire par l'agrément de la langue turque comme langue officielle dans les différentes administrations. Le nombre des langues officielles ne peut être qu'un, et nous aurons prochainement parmi les langues officielles de nos administrations la langue arabe.

Le régime spécial dont on a doté le sandjak d'Alexandrette à la suite de la Convention d'Angora, s'est vu induire par l'agrément de la langue turque comme langue officielle dans les différentes administrations. Le nombre des langues officielles ne peut être qu'un, et nous aurons prochainement parmi les langues officielles de nos administrations la langue arabe.

E 4453, 4453 91]

No. 202

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Major Marshall (Jeddah).

(No. 39.)

Sir,

Foreign Office May 9, 1922.

THE question of slave traffic in the Hedjaz, regarding which you were in correspondence with the British Consul at Jeddah, has been referred to the Foreign Office.

last, has been referred to the Admiralty by the commander-in-chief in the Mediterranean, who has represented in strong terms the desirability of suppressing this traffic.

2. The Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty share Admiral de Robeck's recommendations, and there is no doubt that every effort should be made to bring about the termination of the present state of affairs.

3. I request, therefore, that you will take an early opportunity of informing King Hussein that His Majesty's Government learn with deep distress that slaves are being imported into the Hedjaz and surreptitiously sold there. They are reluctant to suppose that his Majesty is in fact countenancing so iniquitous a trade, which is universally regarded as a disgrace to any enlightened community, but, at the same time, they find it difficult to believe that the local authorities are unaware of its existence. In any case, His Majesty's Government will not be able to enter into treaty relations with the ruler of a country in which such traffic is permitted. They will consequently find themselves compelled to withhold their ratification of the treaty recently concluded between the Emir Abdullah and Colonel Lawrence until such time as they are satisfied that steps have been taken to suppress the slave trade in the Hedjaz.

4. You should, if you are in possession of the necessary information, report by telegram the nationality of the dhows engaged in transporting slaves.

I am, &c.

CURZON OF KEDLESTON

E 4453 4453 91]

No. 203.

Foreign Office to Colonial Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, May 9, 1922.

WITH reference to the letter from the Admiralty dated the 28th ultimo,* I am a despatch which has been addressed to the British agent at Jeddah, instructing him to make representations to King Hussein with a view to the suppression of the slave traffic in the Hedjaz.

2. It is understood that a report has been called for by your Department from the Resident at Aden on the slave traffic in the Yemen, and I am to request that, if this has not already been done, he may be instructed to endeavour to ascertain the nationality of the dhows in which the traffic is carried on, in case Major Marshall is not in possession of this information.

3. I am to transmit herewith a copy of a letter which has been addressed to the Admiralty proposing that the French and Italian Governments shall be approached in the hope of obtaining their support in the endeavour to bring about the termination of the present state of affairs.

I am, &c.

LANCLOT OLIPHANT

E 4847/178/65]

No. 204.

Comte de Saint-Aulaire to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 10.)

LE Saint-Siège a reçu le Gouvernement français d'une demande tendant à l'ajournement de la désignation par le Conseil de la Société des Nations du président de la Commission pour l'Étude des Questions religieuses prévues à l'article 14 du projet du mandat britannique sur la Palestine. En outre, le Nuncio à Paris estime que la présidence en question devrait être donnée à un catholique belge.

L'Ambassadeur de France a été chargé de demander à son Excellence le principal Secrétaire d'État de Sa Majesté aux Affaires étrangères et le Gouvernement britannique n'a pas d'une demande analogue de la part du Saint-Siège.

Le point de vue du Gouvernement français en cette matière n'a pas varié, il la Palestine n'a pas encore reçu l'approbation du Conseil de la Société des Nations, et

l'article 14 de ce projet n'est d'ailleurs destiné qu'à donner effet à l'article 95 du Traité de Sèvres, qui n'a pas été ratifié.

Par suite, le Gouvernement français est l'avis de proposer au prochain conseil de décider d'ajourner cette désignation, toutefois, il pense qu'il y aurait intérêt, le au préalable sur les noms des candidats à présenter au conseil.

Le Comte de Saint-Aulaire salut, &c.

Ambassade de France, Londres.

le 9 mai 1922

E 4854, 78 65]

No. 205

Consul London to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 10.)

(No. 6.)

(Telegraphic.) R

General, May 10, 1922

FOLLOWING for Secretary to the Cabinet from Mr. Tusten.

"Palestine mandate.

"Lord Balfour is prepared to take up mandate question with council, even though formal assent of the United States Government is not yet received."

"Matter will therefore probably come before council early next week.

"Please ask Colonial Office to send out expert as arranged, he should arrive Monday, if possible."

E 4860 78 65]

No. 206

Mr. Harvey to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 11)

(No. 218.)

My Lord,

United States Embassy,

London, May 10, 1922.

WITH reference to your Lordship's note of the 29th April last in regard to the mandate for Palestine, I have the honour to convey to your Lordship my Government's

views on the various subjects which have been under discussion. have not been able to enter without delay into negotiations for the conclusion of a treaty on the lines proposed.

With reference to the safeguarding of the rights of the non-British population in Palestine, my Government is of the opinion that the

preservation of the capitulatory rights of the non-British population is a matter of great importance, and that the mandate itself should not undertake

rights and accordingly the capitulatory rights of the non-British population should be altered so as to read—

"The immunities and privileges of foreigners, including the benefits of capitulation, which were formerly enjoyed by subjects of the Ottoman Empire, are suspended in Palestine, but shall be revived immediately and completely upon the termination of the mandate régime."

It is understood, of course, that the assurances given in paragraph 3 (a) of your letter of the 29th December, 1921, will be suitably embodied in the mandate for Palestine, that is to say, that the assurances regarding the establishment of a court of justice for the non-British population, except in trivial cases where this provision would lead to administrative inconvenience when United States nationals will have the right to sue in the courts of Palestine, composed of a majority of British judges, which my Government considers satisfactory in view of Anglo-Saxon traditions of law.

The Government of the United States is in favour of the amendment in article 28 of the draft mandate, as set forth in paragraph 4 of your note, with the understanding that any arrangements made by the League of Nations relating to the interests of foreigners in judicial matters would not impair any of the rights of the United States and would be ineffective without the consent of the United States. It is understood that if the United States is not satisfied with the proposed amendment, there would be no necessity for the suggested amendment to article 28.

The Government of the United States appreciates the desire of His Majesty's Government to lay the terms of the draft mandate before the Council in an early stage of the negotiations and has no objection to the procedure suggested in paragraph 3 of your Lordship's note, provided that it is understood that the League of Nations shall not be deemed to be binding upon the United States, but shall be subject to the terms and conditions which have been set forth in the draft mandate.

With regard to the suggestion that the Council should be asked to express its views on the subject of the draft mandate, my Government would be pleased to do so, but it does not desire to do so at the present time. The course of the negotiation of the proposed treaty, it can be said, is in the hands of the Council, and it is for the Council to express its views on the subject. My Government will forward its preference upon the subject to the Council at the next meeting of the Council.

The United States is prepared to facilitate in every way the negotiation of the proposed treaty in accordance with the views that have been expressed.

I have, &c.
(For the Ambassador.)
POST WHEELER,
Counsellor of Embassy

E 4861/78 65

No 207.

Mr H. Graham to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 11.)

(No 183.)

(Telegraphic) R

Rome, May 10, 1922

YOUR telegram No. 196 of 4th May Palestine mandate.
Secretary-General informs me that Marquis Imperiali is being instructed in the sense desired.

E 4893/78/65

No 208.

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Consul London (General)

(No. 13.)

(Telegraphic)

Foreign Office, May 11, 1922.

FOLLOWING for Tufton from Acting Secretary, Cabinet:—

Your telegram of 10th May. Palestine mandate.

American note received to-day

They prefer that correspondence should not be made public, so it cannot be laid before Council, but they are publishing communiqué to-day which will serve same purpose.

It is to be used by us in Council if and when necessary.

League's approval of draft mandate

in assent of United States upon

They have also pressed for alteration to article 8 instead of article 28 of mandate.

Office representative with fresh draft memorandum

mandate on the agenda.

E 4887 78 65

No 209

Mr M. Cheetham to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 12.)

(No. 1148.)

My Lord,

Paris, May 11, 1922.

WITH reference to your telegram No. 160 of the 4th instant concerning the Palestine mandate, I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of a note dated the 10th instant which I have received from the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Your Lordship will observe that M. Poincaré is not in favour of the proposal to invite the Council of the League of Nations definitely to approve the terms of the Palestine mandate at their next meeting on the 11th May.

I have, &c.

MILNE CHEETHAM

enclosure in No. 209

M. Poincaré to Lord Hardinge.

Ministre des Affaires étrangères,

Paris, le 10 mai 1922.

M l'Ambassadeur,

PAR une lettre en date du 5 de ce mois, vous avez bien voulu me faire part du désir du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique de faire approuver d'urgence les termes du mandat pour la Palestine par le Conseil de la Société des Nations au cours de la session qui va s'ouvrir le 11 de ce mois.

Je désirerais, en premier lieu, demander au Gouvernement britannique de conclure d'un traité de paix définitif en Orient, il est opportun de faire sanctionner, par le Conseil de la Société, les termes d'un mandat sur une partie de l'ancien Empire ottoman, dont la situation ne pourra être, en droit, fixée qu'après la mise en vigueur du traité avec la Turquie.

Le Gouvernement de la République, tout aussi désireux que le Gouvernement britannique d'obtenir, sans retard, l'approbation définitive des termes du mandat sur la Syrie et le Liban, est obligé de reconnaître que les délais, dus à l'opposition des États-Unis, ont permis que de profondes modifications surviennent à la situation en Orient.

En décembre 1920, quand les projets de mandats ont été déposés à la Société des Nations, l'on pouvait encore escompter une prochaine ratification du Traité de Sèvres, et, en tous cas, les Alliés n'avaient devant eux que le Gouvernement de Constantinople: aucun contact n'avait été pris avec les chefs nationalistes d'Ankara.

Aujourd'hui, et surtout depuis les communications adressées au Gouvernement nationaliste turc par les Ministres des Affaires étrangères de Grande-Bretagne, de France et d'Italie, il n'en va plus de même, et il est à présumer que trop de hâte à faire approuver les mandats nuit à l'œuvre des desseins de pacification générale, que les trois Puissances alliées doivent poursuivre en commun.

Je serai obligé à votre Excellence de soumettre ces observations au Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique. Il vaudrait mieux, à mon avis, réserver cette question pour une prochaine session du Conseil de la Société; cette réunion aura, d'ailleurs, forcément lieu. La Conférence de Genève terminée, puisque le Conseil aura à s'occuper des tâches qui incombent à la Société pour donner suite à certaines résolutions des Commissions économique et financière et des communications de la Conférence de

Cette procédure aura, en outre, l'avantage de ne pas bouleverser l'ordre du jour du Conseil et de ne pas lui proposer soudainement des questions sur lesquelles ses membres n'ont même pas le temps de se documenter auprès de leur Gouvernement.

Les présentes observations ne portent que sur une question d'opportunité et n'affectent aucunement l'entente entre nos Gouvernements telle qu'elle résulte de l'échange des lettres en date des 29 décembre 1921, 9 janvier et 13 janvier 1922.

Veuillez agréer, &c.

R. POINCARÉ.

(8975)

S Q

Government on Palestine mandate. Prime Minister has already spoken to Schanzor on the subject, and will do so again if Lord Balfour pounces him of points at issue."

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Lord Hardinge (Paris)

(No. 1472.)

My Lord.

Foreign Office, May 16, 1922.

WITH reference to Sir Miles Cheetham's despatch No. 1148 of the 11th instant, transmitting a copy of a note from the French Minister for Foreign Affairs on the subject of the Palestine mandate, I shall be glad if you will inform the French Government that, an understanding having now been reached with the Government of the United States on the subject of the Palestine mandate, His Majesty's Government are extremely anxious to obtain the approval of the League of Nations to the terms of the Palestine mandate at the present session.

2. His Majesty's Government do not share the apprehension of the French Government that the raising of this question would affect the negotiations with Turkey, and they assume that the French Government are not contemplating the possibility of making concessions to Turkey which could in any way affect the position of Palestine.

3. His Majesty's Government fully recognise that the definite and formal entry into operation of the mandate depends technically on the cession of the territory by Turkey in the Treaty of Peace. But they are unable to see that the formal approval by the Council of the terms of the mandate must necessarily be postponed until the technical cession of the territory has taken place. They would point out that the French Government themselves, in February 1921, in advising His Majesty's Government that the Council of the League of Nations might be prepared to approve the terms of the "A" mandates in advance of the ratification of the Turkish Treaty, urged that such action should be taken at the then forthcoming session of the Council. His Majesty's Government, though they found themselves at the time reluctantly obliged to postpone the consideration of the mandates for Iraq and Palestine, gave no indication that their representative on the Council would certainly raise no objection to the consideration of the Syrian mandate.

4. His Majesty's Government trust that the French Government will appreciate the fact that, owing to the great haste with which it has been found necessary to conduct the negotiations with the Government of the United States regarding the Palestine mandate, in order to reach an agreement in sufficient time to admit of submitting that mandate to the Council of the League of Nations at its present session, it has not been possible to keep the French Government au courant of the most recent developments in these negotiations.

5. The United States Government have expressed the wish that the correspondence which has taken place should be made public. You should explain to the French Government that the only modification in the terms of the mandate which is being proposed to the Council of the League of Nations is in the case of article 8. The text of this article as now proposed reads: "The immunities and privileges of foreigners, including the benefits of consular jurisdiction and protection as formerly enjoyed by Capitulation or usage in the Ottoman Empire, are suspended in Palestine, but shall be revived immediately and completely upon the termination of the mandate regime, unless the Powers whose nationals were entitled on the 1st August, 1914, to such rights should agree, or have agreed, by treaty to their suspension or modification." The French Government will recollect that, in the note addressed to you on the 9th January they expressed their readiness to agree to the introduction into the terms of the mandate of a stipulation to this effect. His Majesty's Government accordingly assume that they will see no objection to the publication of the correspondence.

6. I feel confident that, in the light of the considerations set forth above, the French Government will see their way to instruct the French representative on the Council to support his British colleagues in endeavouring to regularise the position of His Majesty's Government as mandatory for Palestine pending the final settlement of peace with Turkey, as, for practical reasons of administration, this is of great importance to His Majesty's Government.

I am, Sir,

CURZON OF KEDLESTON

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Mr Harvey.

Your Excellency

W. I. I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th inst. in relation to the mandate, and to inform you that His Majesty's Government are anxious to obtain the approval of the League of Nations to the terms of the Palestine mandate at the present session. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Yours faithfully,
CURZON OF KEDLESTON

I have, Sir,

CURZON OF KEDLESTON

Memorandum communicated to United States Embassy.

WITH reference to the memorandum of the 16th instant from the United States Embassy and the subsequent oral assurance by Mr. P. W. Wilson, Secretary of State, that the United States Government are prepared to accept the terms of the Palestine mandate as proposed to the Council of the League of Nations, I have the honour to inform you that His Majesty's Government are extremely anxious to obtain the approval of the League of Nations to the terms of the Palestine mandate at the present session.

2. His Majesty's Government see, however, no objection to the publication of the correspondence which has taken place. The United States Embassy was good enough to communicate informally to the Foreign Office the terms of the correspondence.

3. It is understood, of course, that the terms of this announcement refer to the Palestine mandate only.

Foreign Office, May 16, 1922.

Sir R. Graham to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 17)

(Unnumbered.)

Telegraphic.) R.

Rome, May 16, 1922.

MY telegram No. 184 of 14th May. Palestine mandate. Secretary-General, in reply to telegram which I had sent to him, writes from Genoa to confirm that he has done all he can to have question settled in the sense I suggested. He states that the Italian Government are extremely anxious to obtain the approval of the League of Nations to the terms of the Palestine mandate at the present session. He also states that the Italian Government are extremely anxious to obtain the approval of the League of Nations to the terms of the Palestine mandate at the present session. He also states that the Italian Government are extremely anxious to obtain the approval of the League of Nations to the terms of the Palestine mandate at the present session. (Repeated to Genoa.)

Major Marshall to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 22)

YOUR telegram No. 18 of 12th May.

his enemies. Zeid and Fuad confirm this. I suggested that Zeid and I should meet pilgrims near Taif, and they should be asked to hand over arms to me there, but the King did not accept, in view of the fact that it might be construed as an attempt to disarm the pilgrims. The King has stopped this year. Question can be reopened after pilgrimage, and fresh attempts made to settle dispute between Hussein and Ibn Saud.

(Copy to Baghdad.)

Sir P. Cox to Mr. Churchill.—(Communicated by Colonial Office, May 25.)

reports since received from Elia Thanasen and from Kowen indicate that large contingents of Akhwan pilgrims are waiting to proceed to the Hadjaz.

Now we Jeddah telegram of the 18th May to the Foreign Office reporting the spread of Akhwan waqeta in the Hedjaz. I received yesterday from Feisal copy of telegram from his brother Zaid urging him to remove his family, as the Hedjaz was in great danger. Feisal followed up the letter by visit to-day. He is clearly much disturbed and points {on} out that he cannot bring away his wife and child without removing other ladies such as his sister, and worst possible impression would be created if he removed them all.

Feisal admits that present dangerous situation is entirely the result of the mad whimsy of his father, which has alienated his subjects as well as his whole neighbourhood; and he urges that influx of large numbers of Akhwan into the Hedjaz at present juncture will, in spite of any assurances given, almost inevitably result in a conflagration which will extend to the Holy Places themselves, at a time when they are full of Moslems of all nationalities, whose lives would be in jeopardy. Consequence will be great consternation throughout Islam, and though His Majesty's Government would not in any way be responsible, it would react injuriously on their prestige and interest.

And when he did not think it would perhaps ease the position of his brothers were to depose his father and make an announcement accordingly, he replied that in principle that would be a salutary measure which he would welcome at heart, but it would be impossible to bring it off just at the time of pilgrimage. I then asked him what he had proposed to do. He replied that he had proposed to appeal to the Sultan to stop his people going on the pilgrimage in the interests of Islam and the Sultan, in answer to this, had said that he would do so at the same time to the effect that His Majesty's Government in no sense supported the Sherref, and that latter would be given a period of three or four months to make terms with the Sultan, and he informed that His Majesty's Government would accept no responsibility for the consequences if he did not do so.

though I feared it was too late for such action to be taken with effect.
It is obviously very difficult for us to make an appeal to Ibn Saud at this late hour; and even supposing he wishes to stop the tide, I doubt if it is physically possible

for him to do so at this juncture. There is, however, probably just time for an appeal to reach him if His Majesty's Government decide to make it.

I suggest that appeal, if made, should be made in the forests of Ilatu as a whole and the message should be in a form which we can publish if necessary. If it proves too late, we shall, at all events, have done our best to avert the danger, but we have no time to lose.

We could not well hold Ben Soud responsible if the Hedjaz voluntarily entered a war with the British, and what would be the effect on India and how far Great Britain would be bound with responsibility for the resulting clash.

Major Marshall to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.—(Received May 26.)

My Lord

Jeddah Mar 10, 1929.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith the Jeddah report for the period the 21st April to the 10th May, 1922.

Copies of this report and dispatch have been sent to Cairo, Baghdad, Jerusalem, Aleppo, Syria, Transjordan and Damascus.

I have, &c

W. E. MARSHALL

Jeddah Report April 21 to May 10, 1922

Pilgrimage.

but a copy of the long time spent on the journey: some have taken ten days on the single journey from Yenchow to Meichow.

[illegible]

- 1 Rice, if not a full sack
- 2 Oil, petroleum and sugar if not a full tin
- Bread called "Kaya", syrup and coconuts, in any quantity
- 3 "Sham" clothes, all used towels and five new ones, for each person
- All perfumes for private use
- Flour, lentils and wheat, not more than one sack per person
- All ladies' ornaments, silk &

With the possible exception of the monograph by the French author, *Le langage des fleurs*, we

The pilgrims from the steamship "Jeddah" (Bombay and Karachi) disembarked yesterday and all full weeks of coverts were set and kept in the customs. These will be claimed by the pilgrims to day and it remains to be seen what tax will be paid.

In any case, considerable commutations have been made. The District of Columbia has

The quarantine arrangements remain entirely unsatisfactory. A new steamer belonging to Hongkong of Hong Kong with H. P. Zing, as captain, arrived from Hongkong on the 10th inst. The ship's officers are allowed to disembark without inspection and the ship allowed to use the harbour after the completion of the quarantine. The ship was put in quarantine for twenty-four hours and the captain was forbidden to come

... Mohammed Hussein, at one time ...
... On the same day, he Italian Consul, Dr. Torre, who is also a medical man, went on board an Italian boat which was in quarantine. The following morning, the Minister for Foreign Affairs at Mecca sent a telegram to all the foreign representatives stating that the Government intended to take action in the matter and that they would not disregard the qualifications of any representative of any Government who interfered with important questions.

This year Indian pilgrims are being registered at the agency ...
... numbered and returned to the holder; counterfoils are deposited ...
... Pilgrims deposit their return tickets and are given a receipt for the same ...
... If they wish to do so they can deposit the ...

Hashimite steamers, the "Paolo" and the "Mawatta" were expected to ...
... on the 27th April. King Hussein arrived from Mecca on that ...
... in honour of the event. The steamers did not arrive ...
... the fact of Ramadan commencing the same ...

The "Paolo," which is a boat of 120 tons, arrived on the evening of the 29th. The arrival was heralded by a salute of ten guns. The "Mawatta," a boat of 31 tons, arrived on the evening of the 1st May and received a similar salute. The purchase of the boats, 6,000 for the two, is not yet complete, and the boats are still in the hands of the Italian Government. It is said that the Hashimite Government wish to pay in instalments; they are to be used for coastal traffic—pilgrims and cargo—as patrol boats and for transport.

At present the masters and chief engineers are Italian, and the crews are Italian native subjects from Mawatta. It is not yet known whether the Hashimite Government intend the services of these people or men the ships with fresh crews. If the latter alternative, the results are sure to be disastrous. They have the latter alternative, the results are sure to be disastrous. They have

These ships are to be used for coastal traffic—pilgrims and cargo—as patrol boats and for transport.

Three native chaloups, two Muslim and a Christian, arrived on the "Paolo" for service with the Hashimite Government.

It is said that the Hashimite Government propose to purchase a large motor launch from Mawatta.

Demonstrations in Mecca and Jeddah.

On account of recent disturbances in Syria, King Hussein ...
... Mecca ...
... on 16th April.

... of the Arab all shams in Jeddah were shut by order of the King. ...
... The ...
... in turn, each of the foreign consulates. I invited the leaders to come to see ...
... The chief spokesman were Sulaiman ...
... Sulaiman, both of Jeddah. The latter was the only one who showed any enthusiasm. The procession was orderly and in great humour.

... and to the president of the Geneva Conference. The ...
... demonstrators are now being ordered to pay for these telegrams.

... at ...
2. In a private letter ...
... identified three persons with ...
... called, and the two ...
3. The French ...

Government that Senegalese should not enter on the pilgrimage. The reason given was the anger of the people of the Hedjaz against the Senegalese for their share in the fighting in Syria.

4. Further ...
... the mosque at ...
... point be responsible sheikh. Retaliation is expected from the Malayan of Khurma ...
... M ...
... who are all local people plus some deserters from the Arab irregular army ...
... Hedjaz, and to plunder only Sherrefian subjects not resident in the towns.

5. Ahmed Ramadan, an Egyptian, who has been town engineer at Medina for some years, has resigned his post and has arrived in Jeddah. He says that there is a strong pro-Turkish party in Medina, and that he was asked by this party to swear an oath of loyalty to the Sultan of Turkey. He refused. He says that the propagandists say that Mustafa Kemal is the hero of Islam, and that all the Turkish ...
... Hedjaz are patiently awaiting the return of the Turks.

Press ("Al Qibla")

No. 578. Leading article reviewing the state of affairs in the East. A particular reference to the reports of aggression ...

Great Britain's attitude is incomprehensible. ...
... cannot possibly attack Iraq. He is not even strong enough to avenge his brother ...

... time both enemy and friend? The Arabs want nothing but perpetual friendship with ...

The Arabs only claim what other nations of less distinguished tradition have already attained. They appear to have advanced not one step since first formulating their claim. If Great Britain wishes to make Ibn Saud Emperor of the peninsula, let her carry on by all means, but without bloodshed. None can disapprove the Mesopotamians if they fight Ibn Saud when driven thereto by political circumstances. Their forefathers have set them a gallant example. We await with anxiety the fabulous and amusing commentaries which will doubtless be made by the Tehran Hamadeh, Laurencean or Philban correspondents of the "Times."

The arrival of the ring-leaders of a demonstration in Damascus during the visit of the American Mr. Crane is noted, and the special attention of the United States Government called to the matter.

No. 579. Leading article deploring the trend of modern Western civilization as typified in the French, who have imprisoned Muslim women in harems. How can a nation with the honourable past of France submit to General Gouraud's description? H ...
... Syria are happy under French Government at a moment when ...
The article ends, after an atrocious pun on the name of Gouraud, with an appeal to the liberal elements in French public life.

The Haurieh aqueduct has been repaired after the ravages of November rains, and water now flows in abundance into Jeddah, "right into the reservoirs."

Reference to the K ...

... houses inhabited by Muslims" having remarked that ...
... according to the Hedjaz for purposes of study, return disease ...
... and having urged the authorities of the ...
... to obviate this risk to the student's health. "Al Qibla" challenges the paper to produce any imitations comparable with those of the Holy Places, and adds that all disease in the Hedjaz is brought from outside. None can deny this but those who "seek to extinguish the Light of God, but He will that His Light should continue."

Commenting upon the attempted assassination of the editor of "Al Maqqa" of ...
... of public security in Beyrouth before entering consultations in the Hedjaz.

Reference is made to the murder of Asad Bey, Minister of the Interior in the Government of Grand Lebanon, in Beyrouth; to the agitation of the "Democratise ...

Assembly" in Beyrout against the Mandatory Powers, and to their confabulations and those of Mr. Crane with the Maronite Patriarch.

An account of Lord Milner's visit to Transjordan and of his replies to an Arab deputation from Ba Salt is reproduced from "Al Subah."

Much space is given to an account, supplemented by extracts from Egyptian newspapers, of the demonstrations in Damascus during and after the visit of Mr. Crane, the American president of the former commission of enquiry. The spokesman of a gathering of 300 or 400 patriots is reported to have expressed to Mr. Crane the universal dissatisfaction of Syrians with the French regime, for numerous reasons, and their aspirations towards complete independence. Mr. Crane replied, telling them to prosecute their claims by lawful means in unity and concord, then would attain their aim if God so willed.

An unspecified number of notables on the other through streets crowded with demonstrators. As a result Dr. Shihabdar and four others were imprisoned by the French authorities. Their fellows closed the shops in protest, named a delegation to represent their case to Europe, and offered themselves for imprisonment with their leaders.

is pictured as yielding in intensity only to the emotions provoked by "Al Qida" and French protection, how long?

By way of consolation readers are reminded that suffer in Syria's pain. By way of consolation readers are reminded that calamities were foreseen, and the Arab warned against inevitable disaster. Hussein in his letter of 21st Zul Qada 1330, long extracts from which the "Aspects" and "Specialists" thanks to whose advice these warnings were disregarded, are reproached with their failure. Circumstances have compelled His Majesty's Government, who were never going to shake the blood-stained hand of Russia, to modify that attitude. Perhaps circumstances will induce His Majesty's Government to be guided by Arab advice. It is great, for "you will find in the river things you can drink."

Let developments in Syria be a warning. Let friends of Reuter and Havas that they make no comment on what is going on in Damascus! Where is America, guarantor of the world's peace? Why no Russo-Bulgarian treaty been signed?

at which patriotic speeches of sympathy with Syria were attended and listened with evident interest. The speaker's words were full of our patience.

It is our turn to strike." &c.

The arrival at Mecca of the first pilgrim caravan returning from Medina, the departure of a second, and the arrival of a third, are reported. With reference to the arrival in Mecca of a caravan of 2,200 camels from Jeddah, Reuter and Havas are twitted with their recent accounts of camels being killed in the desert. The fact that 30 miles of desert in safety, train robberies between Paris and Italy suggest but too recent in cultured Europe.

Articles are reproduced from "Al Moqtatam" on the failure of Zionism and on the revolt of the East.

Mr. Ronald Storrs receives the 1st Class of the Order of Al Wahda, Sheikh Sultan bin Alwan is awarded the 3rd Class (presumably for his exploits at Tarabiah).

Special Supplements

Description of the giant demonstrations of sympathy with oppressed Syria which took place in Mecca. King Hussein, after receiving a gratifying reply, made a speech ordering the people back to work.

King Hussein's address ran as follows—

Be calm, O people, and return to your work. I know that you are passing but that it finds me striving impartially to defend the rights of our peoples the Arabs.

"You have risen to-day to prove your sentiments towards that Syria who appeals for your aid. I appreciate this keenly. It is one of the rights inherent in your national Arab sympathies, &c."

of you. I share that sentiment. But the moment has not yet come when I am of all men the most careful in blood and in protecting their property and houses. And resources are barren of result, then you and I with you are exempt from any responsibility for whatever measures national honour may dictate. He calm and return to your own business. I will take all possible steps to achieve and God's mercy and His blessing be upon you."

No. 582 Under the heading "Good Tidings for the Arabs" is announced the arrival in Jeddah of the first steamer flying the Hashemite flag. In most of fact the purchase price is paid by the Hedjaz Government.

The effect of news from Damascus in Palestine and Transjordan is the subject of a long article.

Account of a memorial service for the Syrian martyrs in the mosque of the Baron. No. 583 continues the relation of incidents in Syria and of the reactions in Palestine and Transjordan. The silence of Reuter and Havas on the subject is proof of a remote attitude.

Lucknow has telegraphed for news of the safety of

be expected in view of the notoriously anti Hedjaz sentiments of Indian Indian Government. As we have often said "What have we to do with

The paper goes on to state that, as thousands of pilgrims can testify, the Medina all other roads are absolutely safe. "The truth is true and cannot be

No reference is made to the tolls levied on pilgrim caravans by Bedouins.

W. E. MARSHALL.

	To—	Arrived.	Left.	Pilgrims Disembarked.	Cargo Discharged.
April 21		April 21	April 21	94	
April 22		April 22	April 22	2	52
April 23		April 23	April 23	18	30
April 24		April 24	April 24	2	4
April 25		April 25	April 25	2	4
April 26		April 26	April 26	2	4
April 27		April 27	April 27	2	4
April 28		April 28	April 28	2	4
April 29		April 29	April 29	2	4
April 30		April 30	April 30	2	4
May 1		May 1	May 1	2	4
May 2		May 2	May 2	2	4
May 3		May 3	May 3	2	4
May 4		May 4	May 4	2	4
May 5		May 5	May 5	2	4
May 6		May 6	May 6	2	4
May 7		May 7	May 7	2	4
May 8		May 8	May 8	2	4
May 9		May 9	May 9	2	4
May 10		May 10	May 10	2	4
May 11		May 11	May 11	2	4
May 12		May 12	May 12	2	4
May 13		May 13	May 13	2	4
May 14		May 14	May 14	2	4
May 15		May 15	May 15	2	4
May 16		May 16	May 16	2	4
May 17		May 17	May 17	2	4
May 18		May 18	May 18	2	4
May 19		May 19	May 19	2	4
May 20		May 20	May 20	2	4
May 21		May 21	May 21	2	4
May 22		May 22	May 22	2	4
May 23		May 23	May 23	2	4
May 24		May 24	May 24	2	4
May 25		May 25	May 25	2	4
May 26		May 26	May 26	2	4
May 27		May 27	May 27	2	4
May 28		May 28	May 28	2	4
May 29		May 29	May 29	2	4
May 30		May 30	May 30	2	4
May 31		May 31	May 31	2	4

H.M.S. "Clematis" arrived on April 27 and left on May 1.

Lord Hardinge to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston — (Received May 26.)

No 1264.

HIS Majesty's Ambassador at Paris presents his compliments to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and has the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a note from the French Government, dated the 23rd May, 1922, respecting the Palestine.

British Embassy, Paris, M.

Enclosure in No. 225

M. Poincaré to Sir M. Cheetham

M. le Charge d'Affaires,

Paris, le 23 mai 1922

Avec bien voulu, le 17 de ce mois, insister au nom de moi pour que le représentant de la République au Conseil de la Société des Nations reçoive des directions en vue de hâter l'approbation par le conseil des termes du mandat sur la Palestine.

La session du conseil a pris fin, vous le savez, le 17 de ce mois. Au cours de cette session, dans des conversations cordiales M. Leon Bourgeois et Lord Balfour ont étudié la question des mandats avec le vif désir d'éviter tout ce qui aurait pu marquer une divergence entre la France et l'Angleterre.

En effet, comme l'indiquait ma lettre du 10 de ce mois, le Gouvernement français avait demandé au Gouvernement britannique de considérer l'opportunité de faire valoir le mandat palestinien pendant la session de mai du conseil si n'avait pas l'intention de manifester une opposition contre la thèse britannique.

En examinant ensemble la question, M. Leon Bourgeois et Lord Balfour ont dû reconnaître qu'il était difficile d'obtenir une majorité parmi les membres du conseil pour la mise en discussion du projet de mandat palestinien. Ils ont convenu de se joindre à demander au conseil de remettre à une prochaine session, fixée au 15 juillet, la discussion des termes des mandats non encore votés. Ils ont estimé, en effet, pendant le court délai qui nous sépare de cette session il sera possible d'obtenir l'agrément du Gouvernement des Etats-Unis pour les mandats qui sont encore en suspens. Il sera sans doute plus facile pour l'ensemble des mandats de lever les oppositions, qui ne sont manifestées à la dernière session du conseil.

Je vous remercie, d'ailleurs, des indications que contient votre lettre du 17 mai sur l'état des négociations entre le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique et le Gouvernement français. L'Ambassadeur de la République à Londres me fera très prochainement Lord Curzon de propositions touchant les mandats (A) et (B). J'ai confiance que la bonne entente de nos deux Gouvernements permettra d'arriver à une solution satisfaisante pour le 15 juillet prochain.

*Agree, &c.
POINCARÉ.*

The Earl of Balfour to Count de Saint-Aulair

Your Excellency,

Foreign Office, May 27, 1922

I HAVE the honour to inform you that His Majesty's Government have learnt that there has of recent months been a recrudescence of slave traffic in Western Arabia.

2. It appears that consignments of slaves have been reaching the Hedjaz from the Yemen, having been shipped into the latter country from the north-east coast of Africa.

3. His Majesty's Government have caused the strongest representations on the subject to be made to King Hussein and have at the same time, instructed the British Resident at Aden to institute detailed enquiries in the Yemen.

4. There is, however, reason to believe that shipments of slaves have been effected

* Also to British Charge d'Affaires, mandataire mandataire.

from the coast of French Somaliland and His Majesty's Government feel it to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to bring about the cessation of such slaves so long as such shipments can be made from the north-east coast of Africa.

I am, therefore, bringing this matter to your attention, and I am sure that the French Government will assist in the effort to stamp out this outrageous traffic.

Somaliland to keep the most careful watch on shipping along the coast of the territory under their control, and I need but add that the British authorities are exerting a similar vigilance under their influence.

Similar representations are being made to the Italian Government as regards reported shipments from Eritrea.

*I have, &c.
BALFOUR*

Count de Salis to the Earl of Balfour — (Received May 29.)

(No. 80)

My Lord,

Rome, May 25, 1922

IN my despatch No. 35 of the 18th April I forwarded to your Lordship a copy of the draft mandate presented by Lord Balfour to the League of Nations on the 7th December, 1920. In my telegram No. 17 of the 21st April, I reported that a further note, making some constructive suggestions, especially with regard to article 14, which deals with the Holy Places, was in course of preparation.

It was, however, the Vatican was not entitled to intervene in the matter.

On the 22nd April, on which there was no ground for supposing that His Majesty's Government wished to ignore the reasonable views of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. But the main random of the Vatican amounted to nothing less than a protest against the whole policy which His Majesty's Government were being urged by the Powers and League of Nations to carry out in Palestine. I am informed that the British representative would make a statement in this sense.

I now have the honour to enclose translation of a note from the Cardinal Secretary of State. It was not the intention of the Holy See to call in question the British mandate for Palestine. Quite the contrary. The draft mandate is now being submitted to the League of Nations for examination and approval and as in this draft there are articles which deserve amendment the Holy See was entitled to express its views. In communicating these views the Holy See was acting with straightforwardness and courtesy; he is surprised that they should have given an unfavourable reception to a note drawn up in that spirit.

*I have, &c.
J. DE SALIS*

Enclosure in No. 230

Cardinal Gasparri to Count de Salis

(Continuation)

Vatican, May 24, 1922

IN reply to your Excellency's recent verbal communication of the 9th May, on the subject of the mandate for Palestine, entrusted to His Britannic Majesty's Government, the undersigned Cardinal Secretary of State has the honour to state as follows.

The Holy See in that note in no way meant to call in doubt the British mandate for Palestine. The draft mandate is now being submitted for examination and approval to the League of Nations, and as in that draft there are articles deserving of amendment the Holy See was entitled to transmit, and indeed has transmitted, to the members of the Council of the League of Nations its observations on the subject. At the same time, the undersigned cardinal believed it to be an act of straightforwardness and courtesy to communicate

those involved in the matter, and it has therefore been not a little surprised that they should have been so concerned with that intention.

P. CARDINAL GASPARRI

E 5448 248 91]

No. 231

Foreign Office to Colonial Office

Foreign Office, May 29, 1922

WITH reference to my letter of the 20th instant, I am directed by the Secretary of State to state, for the information of the Colonial Office, that in view of the information from the British agent at Jeddah, it has been ascertained that the precise nature of the intention of the Holy See is as follows:—

I am, &c.

LANCELOT OLIPHANT

E 5578 248 91]

No. 232

The Earl of Balfour to Major Marshall (Jeddah).

(No. 2.)

(Telegraphic.) R.

Foreign Office, May 31, 1922.

It is telegraphed to you on 22nd May. No. 232. The Holy See has been informed that His Majesty's Government have done everything possible to prevent trouble and cannot intervene further in any way.

(Confidential.)

This applies also to your proposal that you should assist in disarming the pilgrims. The Holy See has been informed that His Majesty's Government have done everything possible to prevent trouble and cannot intervene further in any way. Acting Foreign Minister

E 5476 78 85]

No. 233

The Earl of Balfour to Count de Salis (Vatican).

No. 11

(Telegraphic.)

Foreign Office, May 31, 1922

In view of recent discussion at Vienna regarding Palestine mandate, I wish you to be aware that the Holy See has been informed that His Majesty's Government have done everything possible to prevent trouble and cannot intervene further in any way. I could see you after 10th June. I fear this will interfere with your plans for leave.

E 5600 78 85]

No. 234

Mandate for Palestine

Note by the Secretary-General. (Communicated by League of Nations, May 27, 1922.)

The following letter from Cardinal Gasparri, Secretary of State to the Holy See, is communicated to the Council:—

(Translation.)

The Vatican, May 15, 1922

The Cardinal Secretary of State to the Holy See has the honor to submit to your Excellency, and through your Excellency to the Council of the League of Nations, the following observations regarding the draft British mandate for Palestine, which was laid before the secretariat of the League of Nations by Mr. Balfour on the 7th December, 1920.

The Holy See makes no objection to the same civil rights being conferred on the Jews as are enjoyed by other nationalities and creeds, but it cannot agree:

1. That the Jews should be given a privileged and preponderating position as against the other nationalities and creeds.

That the rights of the Christian denominations should not be adequately safeguarded.

Now, as regards the first point, although the preamble of the draft gives assurance in regard to the creation of a 'National Home' for the Jews, 'that nothing should be done which might prejudice the religious and civil rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, nevertheless it appears from the wording of the articles that there is an intention to confer a definitely preponderating influence, from an economic, administrative and political point of view, on the Jewish element as compared with the other nationalities. Thus in the articles of the draft mandate—

(a.) A Jewish agency, which is nothing less than the very influential Zionist organization, is recognised as a public body (article 4).

(b.) This Jewish agency is given the role of co-operating with the Administration of Palestine and is endowed with very wide powers even in questions regarding 'the development of the country'.

The immigration of Jews (article 6) and the acquisition of Palestinian citizenship by Jews (article 7) are encouraged. Provision is especially made for 'close settlement by Jews' who are even to receive grants of land (article 6). They are also to be given preference in the construction of public works (article 11).

The effect of all these provisions of the draft tending to give the Jewish element a definitely preponderating influence over all the other races of Palestine appears to be not only a grave injury to the established rights of other nationalities, but also to be incompatible with article 22 of the Treaty of Versailles, which defines the nature and the objects of all mandates.

According to the article referred to above, a mandate is a form of protection which is assumed by some Power for the benefit of 'peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world,' and its object is 'the sacred trust of civilisation,' namely, 'the well-being and development of such peoples.'

The passages just quoted are obviously incompatible with a mandate which would prove to be an instrument for the subjection of the native populations for the benefit of another nationality.

As regards the second point, special attention should be directed to article 14 of the draft, which provides—in conformity with article 23 of the Treaty of Sevres—for a 'Council of the Levant' to be constituted by the League of Nations, composed of representatives, in a proportion which is not fixed, of all the religious communities concerned.

It is evident that the Holy See cannot agree that the interests of Catholics should be in the hands of representatives who have not been selected by the competent hierarchical authorities. Moreover, the commission in question has the duty to 'ensure that certain Holy Places, religious buildings or sites, regarded with special veneration by the adherents of one particular religion, are entrusted to the permanent control of suitable bodies representing adherents of the religion concerned.'

The wording of this article is—it will be observed—so vague that it gives rise to a number of difficulties. For instance, nothing is laid down as to the manner in which these 'suitable bodies' representing the different religions are to be constituted, further, no indication is given of the extent of the powers of this body or what steps are to be taken for the protection of the places regarded with such veneration by the adherents of the different religions.

The Holy Places in question are of interest to numerous religions, it is only too probable that bitter dissensions will arise within this commission, composed of representatives of all religions; and that these dissensions will inevitably result in a combination of

all the other members against those of the religion which is in possession of the Holy Places which may be concerned, the result will be to make any reasoned and impartial decision impossible.

"Finally, it should be noted that, by the terms of the mandate, 'the selection of the Holy Places, religious buildings, or sites so to be entrusted shall be made by the Commission, subject to the approval of the mandatory', this clause would, it is clear, give England undue influence, not to mention the fact that it is apparently incompatible with article 36 of the Treaty of Sevres.

"For all these reasons, article 14 appears to be unacceptable, and the Holy See ventures to suggest that the members of the commission should be the consuls maintained in the Holy Land by the Powers represented on the Council of the League

Cardinal has the honour to bring the above considerations to your Excellency's notice, and to request that you will be good enough to submit them to the most excellent Council of the League of Nations.

Yours faithfully,
CARDINAL GISSARD

E 5624 78 65]

No. 235

The Earl of Balfour to Sir A. Gieddes (Washington).

(No. 200.)

(Telegraphic.)

Foreign Office, June 1, 1922.

On reasons which will be familiar to your Excellency it is most important that

apprehension of an impression unfavourable to France being made, the mandate was passed before passing of Syrian mandate was assured. It is not so long as United States Government have not signified their acceptance. This makes it a matter of supreme interest to His Majesty's Government that a Franco-American understanding respecting Syrian mandate should be arrived at in time to allow of both mandates being passed at next meeting of Council on 11th July.

Our mandate for Iraq may not be ready by then, but this need not delay those for Palestine and Syria.

Please endeavour to find opportunity for pressing on State Department the urgency of their settling with France about Syria, using your discretion as to best way and moment of approaching them.

E 5624 78 65

No. 236

The Earl of Balfour to Lord Hardinge (Paris).

(No. 193.)

(Telegraphic.)

(By Bag.)

Foreign Office, June 2, 1922.

At recent meeting at Geneva of Council of League of Nations, I derived distinct impression that French Government were opposed to completion of British mandate for Palestine before similar treatment of French mandate for Syria as tending to imply greater satisfaction on part of League with British administration in Palestine than with that of French in Syria.

I beg your Excellency to do everything possible to expedite agreement between French and United States Governments regarding Syrian mandate at the same time as Sir C. Hurst, who has gone to Paris, is sounding M. Fromageot in connection with the agreement between French, ourselves and United States over "B" mandates. If we may entertain some hope that no further objection to the Palestine mandate will be pressed by the French representative.

Colonial Office consider it most improbable that Iraq mandate can be ready by July. French Government need not, however, feel themselves on that account precluded in any way from pushing forward with Syrian mandate.

I have requested Count de Salis to come home in order to consult with him as regards policy to be pursued vis-à-vis of Vatican. If Holy See were to persist in endeavour to thwart mandates, it will in all probability suffer rebuff, seeing that

mandates are based on covenant of League of Nations, and opposition would really be tantamount to opposing the Treaty of Versailles. At last meeting of Council of League of Nations, Vatican objection proved effective because, as Palestine mandate did not figure on agenda, Catholic Powers were able to side with France and give indirect support to Vatican on this technicality.

E 5654 248 91]

No. 237

Major Marshall to the Earl of Balfour—(Received June 3.)

(No. 36.)

(Telegraphic.) R

Jeddah, June 3, 1922.

YOUR telegram No. 23 of 31st May—Nejd pilgrimage.

In reply, King Hussein says responsibility too great, and that when he hears the near arrival of Nejd pilgrims he and Government officials will proceed to meet them. He also gives ultimatum, which may or may not be sincere, that if no favourable reply is received by 1st July, he will certainly blame us for sending Nejd pilgrims, and he is even capable of making trouble during pilgrimage to justify himself.

(Sent to India and Bagdad, No. 36.)

E 5651 78 65]

No. 238

Lord Hardinge to the Earl of Balfour—(Received June 4.)

(No. 302.)

(Telegraphic.)

Paris, June 3, 1922.

YOUR telegram No. 193.

Sir M. Cheetham saw Political Director this morning and impressed on him the importance of early conclusion of agreement between United States and French Government regarding Syrian mandate. Count de Peretti said that he saw no reason why a satisfactory understanding with United States should not be reached before 11th July.

M. de Peretti took note of the fact that Iraq mandate would be completed before the statement that, in spite of objections raised in French note of 1st May, it did not appear to be any substantial ground for delaying settlement of Silesian mandates until the conclusion of peace with Turkey, which might still be distant.

Political Director also suggested that it should be possible to overcome any difficulties raised by the Vatican.

E 5716 248 91]

No. 239

Sir P. Cox to Mr. Churchill—(Communicated by Colonial Office June 6.)

(No. 38.)

(Telegraphic.)

Bagdad, June 1, 1922.

Letter from Ibn Saud enclosing Khaldun-Mansour's original prayer in mosque were attacked by a force sent by Hussein under M. Mansour, plundered inhabitants and imposed fine of 30,000 dollars. What is motive of incursion and attitude of Idriat in regard thereto. (Addressed to Jeddah, No. 266 S.)

[E 5716 248 91]

No. 240.

Sir P. Cox to Mr. Churchill. — (Communicated by Colonial Office June 6.)

(No. 391)

(Telegraphic.) P

YOUR telegram No. 305 of 27th May

I explained decision of His Majesty's Government to King at my weekly interview 31st May. Cornwallis was present. King was greatly upset, and stated that if he felt bound to leave it once to join his family. In any case, he continued, his mission in Irak would be made impossible if Ibn Saud's authority were established in Hedjaz in any form. We endeavoured to persuade him that his very natural feelings of domestic anxiety probably tended to make him

I said that I thought that we must regard the Secretary of State and rely on Ibn Saud's good faith and power to control his adherents. I said that if he thought that it would be beneficial I would send Ibn Saud a personal telegram impressing upon him that the danger of a great conflagration by ignition of some trivial spark was a very real one, and adjuring him to take possible steps to safeguard against any such contingency. Faisal meanwhile, to reinforce his argument, produced a telegram received from Hussein stating that Khalid bin Mansur had attacked Chamaid district with four battalions of Akhwan, plundered the district, and caused a loss of 20,000 dollars. They had then proceeded to a place about 30 miles north-east of Kuafda. This meant that they had occupied a good ground both for Tihama and for routes south and north.

After leaving King I drafted personal telegram to Ibn Saud and sent it to Waltham, requesting him to show it to the King and to spend the evening with the King.

This was done, and Cornwallis informed me last night that Faisal was still in a great state of perturbation and talking of asking for a slap at once in which to retire to Hedjaz to join his family, though he recognised that this proceeding would probably involve his abdication. In order to cool him down I thought it necessary to inform him that on the strength of the Mikhwah report I would gain communication with you. I am sending no personal communication to Ibn Saud pending your reply.

My immediately preceding telegram to Jeddah was repeated to you. If report regarding Khalid is true (information is very circumstantial), outlook is undoubtedly fraught with danger and possibilities. I also have a report from Kuwait stating that Ibn Saud contemplates sending a force to the Yemen under his second son. I am asking for further particulars about this.

It seems to me that these two items of news, which I will amplify as soon as possible, give His Majesty's Government reasonable grounds for reconsidering their attitude with regard to Hajj. If we cannot press Ibn Saud at this stage to stop it altogether, we could at any rate urge upon him to limit it to smallest possible proportions, and we could warn him at the same time that if untoward developments are caused in the Hedjaz by Khalid's action or any enterprise of his own for the extension of his territory at this juncture, Britain will certainly not absolve itself from grave responsibility for not having exerted her influence to prevent it, and our relations with him will be seriously affected. I would suggest that he be called upon to limit his pilgrims to a minimum, and that after giving him the

British of the Hedjaz to accompany Nejd Hajj as British Government representative, in order that no precaution for preservation of peace might be neglected.

Faisal, as I have already stated, is very mercurial and I trust will soon cool. He suffers, however, from an obsession in regard to anything connected with Ibn Saud, and, though I shall do my utmost to make him see that his present duty lies here in Irak, I cannot but feel that the progress of our policy here will be most injuriously affected by any inconvenient development in the Hedjaz.

Bagdad, June 1, 1922.

[E 5716 248 91]

No. 241.

Mr. Churchill to Sir P. Cox. — (Communicated by Colonial Office June 6.)

(No. 314)

(Telegraphic.) P

YOUR telegram No. 301

I see no objection to your sending Ibn Saud message on the lines suggested

pilgrims to be accompanied by a British Mohammedan official from India

I think this can be done in the time. You should avoid saying anything to Ibn Saud about extension of his territory in Hedjaz from

E 5716 248 91

No. 242

Sir P. Cox to Mr. Churchill. — (Communicated by Colonial Office June 6.)

(No. 314)

(Telegraphic.)

Bagdad, June 2, 1922.

continuation of my telegram No. 301. The expectation against Yemen has been or is being prepared. Origin of rumour was request from people of South Arab to come under protection of Ibn Saud.

E 5654 248 91]

No. 243.

The Earl of Balfour to Major Marshall (Jeddah)

(Signature.)

Foreign Office, June 6, 1922.

YOUR telegram No. 36 of 3rd June: Nejd pilgrimages.

Sir P. Cox was authorised by Colonial Office on 2nd June to send message to Ibn Saud calling upon him to limit his pilgrims to a minimum and was

untoward developments are caused in the Hedjaz by Khalid's action or any enterprise of his own for the extension of his territory at this juncture, Britain will certainly not absolve itself from grave responsibility for not having exerted her influence to prevent it, and our relations with him will be seriously affected. I would suggest that he be called upon to limit his pilgrims to a minimum, and that after giving him the

representative of His Majesty's Government

Above is for your own information.

E 5754 4453 91]

No. 244

U. Cox to the Earl of Balfour. — (Received June 7.)

(Translation.)

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to inform your Lordship that the Government the

also reported a recrudescence of activity marked principally at Tadmor and are transported to

the colonies and not fail to issue instructions to the Governor of Assiut for a rigorous surveillance to be maintained in the territory of our colony and place of embarkation. At the same time the Ministry for Foreign Affairs gave instructions to the Italian Ambassador at Paris to move the French Government

Minister at Addis Ababa to bring, in the most suitable manner, to the attention of the Abyssinian Government this matter of the slave trade which is

suppress in defence of their own population.

I have, &c.
G. CORA

M. de Montille to the Earl of Balfour. — (Received June 7.)

*Ambassade de France, Londres
le 8 juin 1922*

M le Comte,

Le Conseil de la Société des Nations ayant décidé de traiter avant le 15 juillet prochain la question des mandats il a paru indispensable au Gouvernement français de saisir avant cette date le Conseil de ses projets, qui sont déjà arrêtés en ce qui concerne les mandats "A".

Votre Seigneurie se souvient que les textes établis après entente officieuse entre les Gouvernements français et britannique furent déposés à Genève, en décembre 1920. M. Poincaré dut se préoccuper ultérieurement d'apporter un projet relatif à la Syrie et au Liban les modifications répondant aux vues des États-Unis et de prévoir, au même temps, un projet d'accord séparé avec le Gouvernement américain comportant la reconnaissance par ce dernier du mandat français. J'ai l'honneur de faire parvenir, ci-jointe, à votre Seigneurie les textes qui ont été préparés à ce sujet par mon Gouvernement.

Parmi les modifications à apporter au projet de mandat, il a paru au Gouvernement français qu'il serait sans doute insuffisant de déclarer à l'article 5 que les droits résultant des capitulations seraient supprimés. Cette rédaction risquerait en effet de donner l'impression que les Capitulations sont définitivement abolies en Syrie et au Liban et ne seraient pas susceptibles de "revivre" par la seule création du mandat.

Il a donc semblé nécessaire qu'en cas de cessation du mandat, les Capitulations fussent expressément rétablies par un engagement formel de la part de la Syrie et du Liban. Les Nations de ne pas consentir à la cessation du mandat sans que la Syrie et le Liban aient préalablement admis le rétablissement du régime capitulaire s'il était jugé nécessaire.

En raison du parallélisme existant entre la situation de la Syrie et celle de la Mésopotamie, ainsi que de l'appui que les Gouvernements français et britannique ont intérêt à se prêter mutuellement dans la question des mandats, il serait désirable qu'après entente officieuse sur les nouveaux textes relatifs à la Syrie et à la Mésopotamie, les deux Gouvernements les soumettent simultanément au Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Cependant, au cas où le mandat b... .., il est... .., être soumis avant le 15 juillet au Conseil de la Société des Nations, le Gouvernement français n'en serait pas moins tenu de répondre, en ce qui le concerne, au Conseil de la Société des Nations dans les délais qu'il a fixés.

En communiquant à votre Seigneurie les projets ci-joints, je serais heureux de savoir, notamment en ce qui concerne l'addition proposée à l'article 18, s'ils appellent des observations de votre part. M. Poincaré sera également desirieux de pouvoir rendre connaissance aussitôt que possible des minutes et des textes correspondants que le Cabinet de Londres se propose d'adopter pour donner satisfaction au Gouvernement américain en ce qui concerne la Mésopotamie. Aussitôt après la réponse de votre Seigneurie, le texte français sera communiqué, pour accord, au Gouvernement des États-Unis, puis soumis au Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Veuillez, &c.

R DE MONTILLE.

Enclosure 1 in No. 245

Modifications proposées au Texte déposé à la Société des Nations le 1^{er} Décembre 1921

Proposition tendant à l'Approbation des Termes du Mandat pour la Syrie et le Liban.

Le... ..

CONSIDÉRANT que, par l'article... du Traité de Paix avec la Turquie signé à... la Turquie a renoncé en faveur des principales Puissances alliées à tous ses droits et titres sur les territoires de l'ancien Empire ottoman situés au sud de la frontière... ..

Considérant que, par l'article... dudit traité, les hautes parties contractantes... .. de l'article 22, alinéa 4, du Pacte de la Société des Nations, constituée en État indépendant, devant être guidée dans son administration par les conseils et l'aide d'une Puissance mandataire jusqu'au moment où cet État sera en mesure de se gouverner lui-même.

Considérant que les principales Puissances alliées ont décidé que le mandat sur les territoires visés ci-dessus comprenant la Syrie et le Liban serait confié au Gouvernement de la République française, qui l'a accepté.

Considérant que les termes de ce mandat également formés dans les articles...

Que le Gouvernement de la République française s'engage à exercer ledit mandat au nom de la Société des Nations, en conformité avec lesdits articles.

Le Conseil de la Société des Nations approuve les termes du mandat sur la Syrie et le Liban.

Article 5.

... .. y compris la juridiction consulaire et la protection tels qu'ils existent. Toutefois, les tribunaux consulaires étrangers continueront à fonctionner jusqu'à la mise en application de la nouvelle organisation judiciaire prévue à l'article 6.

Article 10.

Le contrôle exercé par le mandataire sur les missions religieuses en Syrie et au Liban... .. pourvu que les... ..

d'assistance publique.

Article 11.

Il appartiendra au mandataire de faire en sorte qu'aucune mesure ne soit prise... .. par rapport à ses propres ressortissants, y compris les sociétés et associations, soit par rapport à ceux de tout autre État étranger, aussi bien en matière fiscale et commerciale qu'au point de vue de l'exercice des industries et professions. Le même traitement sera accordé aux navires et aéronefs. De même, il ne sera... .. au Liban aucun traitement différentiel entre les marchandises originaires ou à destination de l'un desdits États si y aura, dans des conditions équivalentes, liberté de transit à travers... ..

Sous réserve des stipulations ci-dessus, le mandataire pourra établir ou faire établir... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

Le Conseil de la Société des Nations sera nécessaire pour toutes modifications à apporter aux termes du présent mandat. Ce consentement résultera du Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Le Conseil de la Société des Nations prendra toutes dispositions utiles pour que le mandat ne puisse pas être exercé par les ressortissants de la Turquie.

Article 15.

Le Conseil de la Société des Nations sera nécessaire pour toutes modifications à apporter aux termes du présent mandat. Ce consentement résultera du Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Le Conseil de la Société des Nations prendra toutes dispositions utiles pour que le mandat ne puisse pas être exercé par les ressortissants de la Turquie.

Le Conseil de la Société des Nations prendra toutes dispositions utiles pour que le mandat ne puisse pas être exercé par les ressortissants de la Turquie.

Projet de Convention franco-américaine relative à la Syrie et au Liban.

CONSIDÉRANT que par le Traité de Paix conclu avec les Puissances alliées l'Empire ottoman renonce à tous ses droits et titres sur la Syrie et le Liban.

Considérant que par l'article 22 du Traité de Versailles il a été stipulé que ces territoires, cessant de demeurer sous la souveraineté ottomane, seraient placés sous le mandat d'une ou de plusieurs Puissances et que les termes de ce mandat devraient être explicitement définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que les principales Puissances alliées ont exercé le mandat sur la Syrie et le Liban.

Considérant que les termes de ce mandat ont été définis comme suit par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Texte du mandat.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être définis par le Conseil de la Société des Nations.

Article 1.

Les États-Unis et leurs nationaux auront le bénéfice de tous les engagements pris par la France aux termes de ce mandat, y compris les engagements concernant l'égalité économique, sans qu'y puisse faire obstacle le fait que les États-Unis ne sont pas membres de la Société des Nations.

Article 3.

Il est également convenu que les droits de propriété américains en Syrie et au Liban seront respectés et sauvegardés.

Article 4.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Article 5.

Aucune modification qui affecterait les droits résultant de la présente convention ne sera apportée sans l'assentiment des États-Unis aux termes du mandat ci-dessus reproduits.

Article 6.

La présente convention sera ratifiée et les ratifications seront échangées le plus tôt possible. Elle prendra effet du jour de l'échange des ratifications. Au cas où, à la date où elle prendra effet, le mandat n'aurait pas encore été déclaré par le Conseil de la Société des Nations, le Gouvernement de la République française s'engage à exécuter autant qu'il sera possible la présente convention dans l'application qu'il fait du mandat à la demande du Conseil de la Société des Nations.

En foi de quoi

E 5771/248 91]

No. 246

Sp. P. Cox to Mr. Churchill—(Communicated to Foreign Office, June 7.

Telegram to P.

Bagdad, June 5, 1922

YOUR telegram of 2nd June.

In order to gain time in which to communicate with you again, I am informing you that I am meanwhile authorised to send proposed personal message to Ibn Saud while subject is being considered by His Majesty's Government.

I am somewhat perplexed at attitude of disinterestedness displayed in your telegram, and it is causing me no little misgiving.

In first place, I cannot tell whether it is your personal attitude or that of His Majesty's Government, and, secondly, whichever it is, it is important for me to know on what grounds attitude is based. Is it that danger of conflagration is not considered serious in view of Ibn Saud's guarantee, or is it that His Majesty's Government are tired of Hussein and all his works, and consider any change that may come in Hedjaz would be welcomed as being an improvement on existing state of affairs?

It has been given by Hussein, that he is practically demented and that there is no

untoward incident in the Hedjaz during the pilgrimage is bound to react injuriously upon our interests throughout Islam. In India, for instance, it would bring grief to

the rulers for the Hedjaz; it would encourage Kemalists in their claim as an Islamic military Power to regain control over the Holy Places; and generally the blame

any bloodshed either at Mecca or Medina would undoubtedly be laid at our door, and should be charged with inability to secure the safety of pilgrims and neglect to bring the existing danger to the notice of other Islamic States concerned.

I have not reverted to the subject with Feisal since my telegram of 1st June, but he still maintains that, in the event of the danger becoming imminent, he will be in honour bound to join his family. He has sent me a message suggesting that it is

maintenance of security. I doubt whether this suggestion is within the range of practical politics but we would appear to be fully justified in issuing a stern official warning to both parties and also in taking any steps which can be concerted between Jeddah and here for accommodation or meeting of Hajj pilgrims by British agents.

E 5746 76 65]

No 247.

Mr. Dormer to the Earl of Balfour—(Received June 7)

(No 24)

(Telegraphic) R.

YOUR telegram No. 13

Count de Sals left for London last night.

Vatican, Rome, June 6, 1922

E 5777 4453 91]

No. 248

Colonial Office to Foreign Office.—(Received June 8.)

Sir,

Colonial Office, June 7, 1922.

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to transmit to you, for information of the Earl of Balfour, a copy of a despatch from the Political Resident in Aden, on the subject of the slave traffic in the Hedjaz.

I am, &c.

J. F. MASTERTON SMITH

Enclosure 1 in No 248

Political Resident, Aden, to Mr. Churchill

No. 71 (Confidential.)

Sir,

Aden, May 18, 1922.

WITH reference to your confidential despatch and telegram, dated respectively the 11th and 15th May, 1922, I beg to inform you that I have been in communication with the Political Resident in Aden, on the subject of the slave traffic in the Hedjaz.

Captain M. Fazluddin, I.M.S., has been in communication with the Political Resident in Aden, on the subject of the slave traffic in the Hedjaz.

Political Officer, Hodeida, and I shall communicate the result to you in due course.

I have, &c.

T. E. SCOTT Major-General

Enclosure 2 in No. 248

Report by Captain Fazluddin to the First Assistant Resident, Aden.

IN REFERENCE your endorsement of the 16th February last, I beg to report that I have been in communication with the Political Resident in Aden, on the subject of the slave traffic in the Hedjaz.

As a result of my visit to the Hedjaz during the last ten years have been saved from the hands of the slave traders of Madi and Habi, and the slave trade has been completely suppressed.

I have, &c.

I have, &c.

pressure from Sayed Mustapha, who, though he personally takes no objection

trade as such, always tries to please us by taking severe actions against any cases in which slavery is concerned, and partly on account of the Hedjaz Government at present taking no objection to the landing of slaves at Jeddah or any other place on the Hedjaz coast. Consequently it does not now pay the Dunkali slave dealers to send their modities to Madi or Habi and thus pay the commission of the agents there in addition to the heavy customs duty at Jeddah.

As regards, however, the eighty slave children imported into Jeddah in January last as reported by the Political Resident in Aden, I have not seen to or any evidence that they have passed through Madi or Habi. The customs house records of Madi are absolutely blank about the year 1922, and no copies of transshipments from that port during December 1921 and January 1922, the only two months of which the records I have seen. I shall, however, endeavour to obtain the records of the customs house or any other persons take to it in the Idrian country.

M. FAZLUDDIN, Captain, I.M.S.,

Political Officer, Hodeida

Aden, March 22, 1922

E 5797 33 65]

No 249

Colonial Office to Foreign Office.—(Received June 8.)

Sir,

Colonial Office, June 8, 1922.

I AM directed by Mr. Secretary Churchill to invite reference to Cabinet Paper N. O.P. 3748 of the 17th February, with which was circulated a draft of the proposed treaty with King Faisal of Iraq, and to transmit herewith, for the information of the Earl of Balfour, copies of telegrams, Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, which were sent to the High Commissioner for Iraq on this subject.

These telegrams were discussed on the 1st June by an Inter-Departmental Conference, at which the Foreign Office were represented, and which was also attended by Mr. Tait. Subject to the P.P. of the conference, Mr. Churchill proposed in the terms of the four draft telegrams, which are also transmitted herewith.

2. The conference assumed that the word "independent" had been inadvertently retained both in the preamble and in article 10, since it had been deleted from article 1.

3. With regard to article 1, I am to inform you that in a personal telegram dated the 30th April the High Commissioner for Iraq reported as follows:

"Up to the present Faisal has not gone back on his request that words 'at the request of His Majesty the King of Iraq,' which your draft omits, should be inserted. Can this not be considered? It does not seem crucial, and Faisal's obligation to be guided by our advice in important matters appears to afford adequate safeguards."

Mr. Churchill replied, in a telegram dated the 1st June, "I am prepared to give way on article 1." The words were "at the request of His Majesty the King of Iraq," which your draft omits, should be inserted. Can this not be considered? It does not seem crucial, and Faisal's obligation to be guided by our advice in important matters appears to afford adequate safeguards."

I have, &c.

Mr. Churchill replied, in a telegram dated the 1st June, "I am prepared to give way on article 1." The words were "at the request of His Majesty the King of Iraq," which your draft omits, should be inserted. Can this not be considered? It does not seem crucial, and Faisal's obligation to be guided by our advice in important matters appears to afford adequate safeguards."

5. With regard to article 4, considerable difficulty has always been anticipated by Sir P. Curzon. After fully considering the arguments brought forward in favour of the

[8975]

being now proposed by King Faisal and his Ministers, and after informal consultation with representatives of His Majesty's Treasury and discussion by the Inter-Departmental Committee.

Mr. Churchill has decided, subject to Lord Balfour's approval, to retain the retention of the original article down to the words "for the whole period of this treaty" and to accept the present proposal for the remainder of the article. I am to point out that the separate financial agreement provided for in article 15 will ensure that the financial liabilities and obligations incurred by them to His Majesty's Government, and that the modified wording now adopted for the second half of the article will not involve any direct financial risk. Mr. Churchill has been guided throughout in his consideration of the second half of this article by his conviction that any apparent advantage secured by a stricter wording would be more than counterbalanced by the possible creation of an atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust.

6. With regard to article 5, the conference saw no objection to King Faisal's proposed addition to the Colonial Office alternative in Cabinet C P-3748, which was subsequently approved by the Cabinet. He accordingly proposes to con-

With regard to article 17, I am to point out that the insertion of the provision that the treaty should remain in force after the expiry of the twenty years' period until its termination had been approved by the Council of the League of Nations on the application of either or both of the high contracting parties was originally inserted at the request of the Foreign Office. Mr. Churchill has given this matter his careful consideration, and concurs in the recommendation of the conference, at which, however, the foreign representatives reserved their opinion, that His Majesty's Government, in accepting the mandate for Iraq, has not incurred a permanent and indefinite responsibility. He feels that the treaty with His Majesty King Faisal is not the place for a provision of this kind to be inserted, even if it were decided that some such provision should be included in the draft mandate. He is confident that Lord Balfour will concur in this view and that he will agree to treat the question as one which affects the relations between His Majesty's Government and the League of Nations rather than as affecting the instrument which defines the relations between His Majesty's Government and the Iraq Government under the mandate.

8. I am to request that Mr. Churchill may be favoured with a very early reply to this letter, since the High Commissioner has reported that the political situation in Iraq will be greatly eased by the definite conclusion of the treaty negotiations. Lord Balfour will observe that the penultimate sentence of the first draft telegram provides for the conclusion of a treaty with the United States on the lines of the proposed treaty relating to the Palestine mandate.

I am, &c.
R. SHUCKBURGH.

Enclosure 1 in No. 249

Sir P. Cox to Mr. Churchill

My dear Sir,
I have the pleasure to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th May, though I am sorry to say that I have not yet had time to reply to it. I am, however, in a position to inform you that the Government have decided to accept the present proposal for the remainder of the article. I am to point out that the separate financial agreement provided for in article 15 will ensure that the financial liabilities and obligations incurred by them to His Majesty's Government, and that the modified wording now adopted for the second half of the article will not involve any direct financial risk. Mr. Churchill has been guided throughout in his consideration of the second half of this article by his conviction that any apparent advantage secured by a stricter wording would be more than counterbalanced by the possible creation of an atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust.

Article 3 runs: "His Majesty the King of Iraq agrees to frame an organic law for presentation to Constitutional Assembly of Iraq and to give effect to said law, which must not contain provisions inconsistent with the terms of this article and of those

of articles 9, 11 and 12 of the present treaty and shall take account, &c. Remainder of article stands.

Article 4 runs as follows: "Without prejudice to provisions of article 17, the Government of Iraq shall be bound to observe the provisions of the present treaty in what is conducive to a sound financial and fiscal policy, and to the permanence and good organisation of finances of Iraq Government so long as the Government is under financial obligation to Government of His Britannic Majesty."

Article 5. Read words "In London and other capitals and places" instead of words "In London and other places."

Article 17 runs as follows: "The present treaty shall remain in force after the expiry of the twenty years' period until its termination had been approved by the Council of the League of Nations on the application of either or both of the high contracting parties was originally inserted at the request of the Foreign Office. Mr. Churchill has given this matter his careful consideration, and concurs in the recommendation of the conference, at which, however, the foreign representatives reserved their opinion, that His Majesty's Government, in accepting the mandate for Iraq, has not incurred a permanent and indefinite responsibility. He feels that the treaty with His Majesty King Faisal is not the place for a provision of this kind to be inserted, even if it were decided that some such provision should be included in the draft mandate. He is confident that Lord Balfour will concur in this view and that he will agree to treat the question as one which affects the relations between His Majesty's Government and the League of Nations rather than as affecting the instrument which defines the relations between His Majesty's Government and the Iraq Government under the mandate."

For my comments see my letter of the 11th May.

For articles stand as they are. For my comments see my letter of the 11th May.

For articles stand as they are. For my comments see my letter of the 11th May.

For articles stand as they are. For my comments see my letter of the 11th May.

For articles stand as they are. For my comments see my letter of the 11th May.

Enclosure 2 in No. 249

Sir P. Cox to Mr. Churchill

(No. 379.)

Telegraphic. P.

May 28 1922.

I submit following comment on treaty modifications given in my immediately preceding telegram:—

Preamble. Council of Ministers apparently desirous of maintaining the treaty as a whole, but rather to the specific articles concerned.

Article 1. Additional words are intended to disarm criticism of the existing treaty, but not to object in principle to their proposed please consider whether reference to articles mentioned suffices or not. I am also considering this point.

Article 4. Reason given for omitting reference to the last sentence of article 17 is that now word "interests" is omitted. I am also considering this point.

Article 5. Reason given for omitting reference to the last sentence of article 17 is that now word "interests" is omitted. I am also considering this point.

Article 17. Reason given for omitting reference to the last sentence of article 17 is that now word "interests" is omitted. I am also considering this point.

Article 18. Reason given for omitting reference to the last sentence of article 17 is that now word "interests" is omitted. I am also considering this point.

Article 19. Reason given for omitting reference to the last sentence of article 17 is that now word "interests" is omitted. I am also considering this point.

Article 20. Reason given for omitting reference to the last sentence of article 17 is that now word "interests" is omitted. I am also considering this point.

Article 21. Reason given for omitting reference to the last sentence of article 17 is that now word "interests" is omitted. I am also considering this point.

Article 22. Reason given for omitting reference to the last sentence of article 17 is that now word "interests" is omitted. I am also considering this point.

Article 23. Reason given for omitting reference to the last sentence of article 17 is that now word "interests" is omitted. I am also considering this point.

Article 24. Reason given for omitting reference to the last sentence of article 17 is that now word "interests" is omitted. I am also considering this point.

Article 25. Reason given for omitting reference to the last sentence of article 17 is that now word "interests" is omitted. I am also considering this point.

Article 26. Reason given for omitting reference to the last sentence of article 17 is that now word "interests" is omitted. I am also considering this point.

Article 27. Reason given for omitting reference to the last sentence of article 17 is that now word "interests" is omitted. I am also considering this point.

Article 28. Reason given for omitting reference to the last sentence of article 17 is that now word "interests" is omitted. I am also considering this point.

Article 17. They do not like the idea of being at the mercy of the League of Nations on completion of the twentieth year of the treaty. I have explained difficulty of allowing no discretion to the League to insist on Great Britain's responsibilities being continued in the event of Iraq being unfit for complete freedom from supervision. I suggest that a solution would be to alter last sentence of article to run "termination and any modification which may be agreed upon," &c.

It would be very convenient for me to have earliest possible indication of your views regarding modifications.

Enclosure 3 in No. 249

Draft Telegrams to Sir P. Coz.

(1)

June 1, 1922

YOUR telegram Nos. 378 and 379 of the 28th May. Preamble. I presume word "independent" inadvertently retained both here and in article 16. Subject to its deletion I concur in draft preamble.

Article 1. No objection.

Article 3. You should press for retention of words "shall be in conformity with provisions of present treaty." There are many other articles besides those quoted which might be nullified by a badly framed organic law.

Article 4. You may agree to wording given in my immediately following telegram (see my telegram No. 249 containing message to Feisal).

Article 5. No objection.

In view of contemplated treaty with America, following should be inserted after "League of Nations" in Article 11: "or of any State to which His Britannic Majesty has agreed by treaty that the same right should be ensured as it would enjoy if it were a member of the said League."

Article 17. Foreign Office agrees on reconsideration to delete provision for treaty remaining in force after expiry of twenty years. Your proposed solution is therefore accepted.

(2)

June 1, 1922

Following is draft of article 4 —

Without prejudice to the provisions of article 17 of this treaty, His Majesty the King of Iraq agrees to be guided by the advice of His Britannic Majesty, tendered through the High Commissioner, in all matters relating to the political, financial and financial obligations and interests of His Britannic Majesty for the whole period of this treaty. His Majesty the King of Iraq will fully consult (or pay due regard to the advice of) the High Commissioner on what is conducive to a sound financial and fiscal policy, and will ensure the permanence and good organisation of the finances of the Iraq Government so long as that Government is under financial obligations to the Government of His Britannic Majesty.

I trust that my telegram No. 249 will finally solve outstanding difficulties, and that you will be able to proceed to sign the treaty.

We could not possibly agree to phrase "agrees to accord all due consideration to" in article 4. Feisal must surely realise that this is a meaningless undertaking since he could always assert that our arguments had been duly considered, but regrettably rejected. Nor can we accept deletion of word "interests" since "obligations" alone, whether international or financial, are not sufficiently comprehensive. I do not fully understand argument that substitution of High Commissioner for His Britannic Majesty involves any diminution of control by His Majesty's Government. Though I have accepted proposed modifications for local consumption, the High Commissioner will, of course, be responsible to His Majesty's Government in this as in all other matters.

The English and Arabic texts as finally agreed should be sent by the first air

I am sending by next air mail the English draft as finally approved here, but need not await it if you are satisfied that our intentions are clear and delay is objectionable. The treaty should not be published until I have had sufficient warning to arrange simultaneous publication. — L. —

You are authorised to give Feisal personal message in my immediately following telegram.

(4.)

June 1, 1922

Following is message referred to in my immediately preceding telegram:—

"I have never doubted your sincerity, and am confident that you will work in closest friendship and co-operation with High Commissioner in future as you have in the past. You will recognise that it was with reluctance that I felt bound to point out to you that insistence upon cancellation of mandate which merely defines our so-called partnership, and which would deprive you of the support and assistance which you have hitherto received from us, would be a serious blow to the continuance of our advice and support. I rely upon you now not merely to accept the treaty for yourself, but to use every effort to carry the country with you when National Assembly meets to discuss it. Do not think that I have not realised your local difficulties. I fully realise them, and to the extent that we are free ourselves we have done our best to meet them. I trust that signature of this treaty will mark commencement of a long period of prosperity and progress in Iraq."

E 5813 248 91]

No 250

Sir P. Coz to Mr. Churchill. — (Communicated to Foreign Office, June 8.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

My telegram of 1st June

Bagdad, June 6, 1922

Jeddah reply, dated 2nd June, which apparently was not repeated to London, is as follows —

"March 9.

"Your telegram No. 266.

"I can confirm attack on Ghazal carried out by Khalid, Bin Atiyah, of Hukuk, Sultan of Iraq, and his followers, who are now in the hands of the British. It is also calculated development of Mudayyatiya movement. Emir Zaid assures me that attack on Tarabiah was personal reprisal by Hajili for loss of property there, and that Hussein had nothing to do with it. I have also received a letter from Hussein and rumoured telegram to Emir Ali suggest some complicity. Apart from your despatch, I have no knowledge of attitude of Idri.

E 5783/78 65]

No 251.

Sir A. Geddes to the Earl of Balfour — (Received June 8.)

(No. 261)

(Telegraphic.)

YOUR telegram No. 260.

Washington, June 7, 1922.

Neither Secretary of State nor my French colleague has received any recent communication in regard to the proposed treaty. My French colleague has telegraphed for instructions.

E 5801 4453 91]

No 252

The Earl of Balfour to Major Marshall (Jeddah)

(No. 26.)

"June 11.

Foreign Office, June 8, 1922.

YOUR telegram No. 35 of 27th May. Slave traffic in Hedjaz. You are authorised to confirm your representations to such language as you consider unlikely to have an adverse effect on our relations with King H.

[E 5809/248/91]

No. 253

The Earl of Balfour to Major Marshall (Jeddah).

Foreign Office, June 8, 1922.

(Telegraphic.) R

YOUR telegram No. 36 of 3rd June.

It is to be noted that if trouble arises during pilgrimage owing to any aggressive action on his part, our relations with him will be seriously affected. It is suggested that Mahon medan official from Hahrein should accompany Nejdia, either as interpreter or in supplement to this proposal. Mahon at Hadjar end. If Hussein agrees, and if you means of ensuring peaceful pilgrimage, you should make direct communication with Sir P. Cox, to whom this telegram is being repeated.

[E 5809/248/91]

No. 254

The Earl of Balfour to Major Marshall (Jeddah).

Foreign Office, June 8, 1922.

(No. 28.)

(Telegraphic.)

YOUR telegram No. 408 of the 5th May.

His Majesty's Government are by no means indifferent, but their attitude as defined in correspondence ending with my telegram No. 314 is governed by following

Military intervention of any kind is out of the question. His Majesty's Government are as His Saud and has given no guarantee that he will not be the aggressor. On the other hand, has promised to refrain from hostilities unless attacked. The only element have over him is the fact that he is unwilling to of his breaking his promise. It is suggested by yourself in following telegram that a warning on similar lines to being concert with British Agent, Jeddah, whether Nejdia should be accompanied or met at both substance of my telegram No. 314 has been communicated to Jeddah by Foreign Office.

(Sent to Bagdad with Colonial Office No. 325.)

[E 5858/78/88]

No. 255

Sir C. Hurst to the Earl of Balfour.—(Received June 10.)

My Lord,

Paris, June 9, 1922.

As I have explained to M. Fromageot, the Palestine drafts of 1921, i.e., the communications to, or accepted by, the French Government modifications which M. Fromageot and the member of the Syrian mandate at the forthcoming session of the Council of the League of Nations, as negotiations were still proceeding with the American oil interests as to oil in Iraq, and it was desired not to proceed with this mandate until these negotiations were finished. There was no reason, however, why the French Government should not proceed with the Syrian mandate (if they would then be in a position to do so). M. Fromageot gave me copies of a draft treaty between France and the United States concerning the Syrian mandate which he had prepared, and the list of modifications to be made in the text of the Syrian mandate, which is already in your Lordship's possession. These reports form Enclosures 3 and 4 to this report.

On the question, I felt unable to contribute any suggestions to meet the French objections.

On the subject of the new clause 8 of the Palestine draft, dealing with the suspension of the regime of the Capitulations, I found that M. Fromageot had adopted the formula which has been proposed by the American Government and accepted by His Majesty's Government, to the effect that the rights should be suspended while the mandate is in force, and should, in the absence of a new agreement, revive on its termination. The reason is that from the theoretical point of view it is the severance of the territory from Turkey which abrogates the Capitulations. He much prefers the formula which the French Government have now suggested for article 5 of the Syrian mandate in their note of the 6th June: "Seront sans application en Syrie et au Liban les privilèges et droits des étrangers," coupled with a provision to article 18 (corresponding to article 18 of the Palestine mandate) that "Le Conseil de la Société des Nations prendra des mesures utiles pour que le présent mandat ne prenne pas fin sans que les privilèges des étrangers... aient été rétablis tels qu'ils y existaient au 1914 dans les pays visés par ce mandat, exception faite pour les ressortissants des États... dont l'entière ou partiellement à ce rétablissement."

From the purely legal point of view this formula may be the more correct, but I pointed out to M. Fromageot that His Majesty's Government were already bound via the United States by the new text which they had accepted. In these circumstances we agreed that the French Government should propose to the American Government their new formula which is given above, and then, if the United States can be induced to accept it, and if opportunity offers, the French formula can be substituted in the Palestine mandate for the American formula which His Majesty's Government have accepted.

Apart from article 25, the draft of the Palestine mandate, as enclosed with this report, may be regarded as accepted by the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs. It follows—

Preamble—"Renounced" instead of "renounced." (The Treaty of Sèvres is not yet in force.)

Article 1—"This" for "the present"

Article 2—"Affect" instead of "affect"

Article 3—"it" instead of "it"

Article 4—"This" for "the present," and omission of the proviso

Article 5—Second paragraph, "Members of the League" for "Powers Signatories of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey"

I have given copies of the Palestine draft mandate in the form enclosed as agreed with M. Fromageot to the Italian and Japanese members of the Committee of Legal Advisers, warning them that article 25 may undergo further modification. I have also given them copies of the draft treaty with the United States, which forms Enclosure 2 to this report. The terms of this draft treaty I agreed with M. Fromageot.

As regards the Syrian and Mesopotamian mandates, I explained to M. Fromageot that His Majesty's Government were in favour of the Syrian mandate at the forthcoming session of the Council of the League of Nations, as negotiations were still proceeding with the American oil interests as to oil in Iraq, and it was desired not to proceed with this mandate until these negotiations were finished. There was no reason, however, why the French Government should not proceed with the Syrian mandate (if they would then be in a position to do so). M. Fromageot gave me copies of a draft treaty between France and the United States concerning the Syrian mandate which he had prepared, and the list of modifications to be made in the text of the Syrian mandate, which is already in your Lordship's possession. These reports form Enclosures 3 and 4 to this report.

I trust that the result of my discussions in Paris may be that negotiations may now be initiated with the United States Government on a satisfactory basis, and that the terms of the Palestine and Syrian mandates may be finally approved at Geneva in July.

I have, &c.

CECIL J. B. HURST

WHEREAS by article 132 of the Treaty of Peace signed at Sevres on the 10th of August 1920, Turkey renounces its interest of the Principal Allied Powers in all title over Palestine, and

Whereas by article 95 of the said treaty the high contracting parties agreed to
within such boundaries as might be determined by the Principal Allied Powers, to a
mandatory to be selected by the said Powers; and

...should be responsible for putting into effect the declaration originally made on the 2nd November, 1917, by the Government of His Britannic Majesty, and adopted by the other Allied Powers, in favour of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country, and

Whereas recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the ~~German people with Palestine and its~~ records for reconstituting their national ~~unity~~ in that country, and

Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have selected His Britannic Majesty as the mandatory for Palestine, and

Whereas the terms of the mandate in respect of Palestine have been formulated in the following terms and submitted to the Council of the League for approval, and

Following provision,

Hereby approves the terms of the said mandate as follows:—

His Britannic Majesty shall have the right to exercise as mandatory all the powers

The mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic system as will best serve the interests of the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion.

The mandatory shall encourage the widest measure of self-government for localities consistent with the prevailing conditions.

An appropriate Jewish agency shall be recognized as a public body for the purpose of representing the Jewish population in Palestine, and, subject always to the control of the Administration, to assist and take part in the development of the country.

The Zionist organization, so long as its organization and constitution are in the
 alition with His Britannic Majesty's Government to secure the co-operation

The mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that no Palestine territory shall be ceded or leased to, or in any way placed under the control of the Government of any foreign Power.

ARTICLE 15

other sections of the population are not prejudiced, shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions. It shall facilitate the immigration of Jews on the land referred to in article 4 alone settlement by Jews on the land referred to in article 4 waste lands not required for public purposes.

Abstract

The Administration of Palestine will be responsible for enacting a nationality law. There shall be included in this law provisions framed so as to facilitate the acquisition of Palestinian citizenship by Jews who take up their permanent residence in Palestine.

ARTICLES

The immunities and privileges of foreigners, including the benefits of consular jurisdiction and protection as formerly enjoyed by Capitulation or usage in the Ottoman Empire, are suspended in Palestine, but shall be revived immediately and completely upon the termination of the mandate régime, unless the Powers whose nationals were entitled on the 1st August, 1914, to such rights should agree, or have agreed, by treaty to their suspension or modification.

ARTICLE 9

...meaning that the judicial system established in
...; b) the law, and (to the extent
...ing in Palestine with regard to questions
... (such as the laws of war) and
... Datary agrees that the control and administration
... exercised in accordance with religious law and the dispositions of the
founders.

ARTICLE 16

Pending the making of special extradition agreements relating to Palestine, the extradition treaties in force between the mandatory and other foreign Powers shall apply to Palestine.

4 頁下段 1. 行 11

The Administration of Palestine shall take all necessary measures to safeguard the interests of the community in connection with the development of the country and, subject to article 311 of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey shall have full power to provide for public ownership or control of any of the natural resources of the country or of the public works, services and utilities established or to be established therein. It shall encourage, in the most effective manner, the development of agriculture, stock raising and other things, to the desirability of promoting the slow settlement and intensive cultivation of the land.

The Administration may arrange with the Jewish Agency mentioned in article 4 to construct or operate, upon fair and equitable terms, any public works, services and undertakings and to levy a tax on the profits, in so far as these matters are not directly undertaken by the Administration. Any such arrangements shall provide that the profits shall not exceed a reasonable rate of interest on the capital, and any further profits shall be utilised by it for the benefit of the country in a manner approved by the Administration.

ANTT 1 1_

... and the right to issue exequaturs to consuls appointed by foreign Powers. He shall also be entitled to afford diplomatic and consular protection to citizens of Palestine when outside the territorial limits.

ARTICLE 13

1. The mandatory shall see that the Holy Places and religious buildings or sites are preserved in connection with the Holy Places and religious buildings or sites, that of preserving existing rights, of securing free access to religious buildings and sites and the free exercise of worship, while ensuring the requirements of public order and decorum is assumed by the mandatory who will be responsible solely to the League of Nations in all matters connected therewith provided that nothing in this article shall prevent the mandatory from entering into such arrangement as he may deem reasonable with the Administration for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this article into effect, and provided also that nothing in this mandate shall be construed as conferring upon the mandatory authority to interfere with the fabric or the management of purely Moslem sacred shrines, the immunities of which are guaranteed.

ARTICLE 14

In accordance with article 98 of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey, the mandatory shall as soon as possible a special commission to study the interests relating to the different religious communities of this commission the religious interests concerned will be represented. The chairman of the commission will be appointed by the Council of the League of Nations. It will be the duty of this commission to ensure that certain Holy Places, religious buildings or sites regarded with special veneration by the adherents of one particular religion are entrusted to the permanent control of suitable bodies representing the adherents of the religion concerned. The selection of the Holy Places, religious buildings or sites so to be entrusted, shall be made by the commission, subject to the approval of the mandatory.

In all cases dealt with under this article, however, the right and duty of the mandatory to maintain order and decorum in the place concerned shall not be affected, and the buildings and sites will be subject to the provisions of such laws relating to public monuments as may be enacted in Palestine with the approval of the mandatory.

The rights of control conferred under this article will be guaranteed by the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 15.

The mandatory will see that complete freedom of conscience and the free exercise of all forms of worship, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, is ensured to all. No discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Palestine on the ground of race, religion or language. No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of his religious belief.

The right of each community to maintain its own schools for the education of its own members in its own language (while conforming to such educational requirements of a general nature as the Administration may impose) shall not be denied or impaired.

ARTICLE 16

The mandatory shall be responsible for exercising such supervision over religious or public order and good government. Subject to such supervision, no measures shall be taken in Palestine to obstruct or interfere with the enterprise of such bodies or to discriminate against any representative or member of them on the ground of his religion or nationality.

ARTICLE 17.

The Administration of Palestine may organize on a voluntary basis the forces necessary for the preservation of peace and order, and also for the defence of the country, subject however to the supervision of the mandatory but shall not use them for purposes other than those above specified save with the consent of the mandatory. The Administration of Palestine.

Nothing in this article shall preclude the Administration of Palestine from contributing to the cost of the maintenance of forces maintained by the mandatory.

The mandatory shall be entitled at all time to use the roads, railways and ports of Palestine for the movement of armed forces and the carriage of fuel and supplies.

ARTICLE 18

The mandatory must see that there is no discrimination in Palestine against the nationals of any of the States Members of the League of Nations (including companies incorporated under their laws) as compared with those of the mandatory or of any foreign State in matters concerning taxation, commerce or navigation, the exercise of industries or professions, or in the treatment of merchant vessels or civil aircraft.

The mandatory shall see that there is no discrimination in Palestine against the nationals of any of the States Members of the League of Nations (including companies incorporated under their laws) as compared with those of the mandatory or of any foreign State in matters concerning taxation, commerce or navigation, the exercise of industries or professions, or in the treatment of merchant vessels or civil aircraft.

Notwithstanding as aforesaid and to the other provisions of this mandate, the Administration of Palestine may, on the advice of the mandatory, impose such taxes and customs duties as it may consider necessary, and take such steps as it may think best to promote the development of the natural resources of the country and to safeguard the interests of the population.

Nothing in this article shall prevent the Government of Palestine, on the advice of the mandatory, from concluding a special customs agreement with any State, the territory of which in 1914 was wholly included in Asiatic Turkey or Arabia.

ARTICLE 19

The mandatory will adhere on behalf of the Administration to any general international conventions already existing or that may be concluded hereafter with the approval of the League of Nations respecting the slave traffic, the traffic in arms and ammunition, or the traffic in drugs, or relating to commercial equality, freedom of transit and navigation, aerial navigation and postal, telegraphic and wireless communication or literary, artistic or industrial property.

ARTICLE 20

The mandatory will co-operate on behalf of the Administration of Palestine, with the League of Nations in any measures which may be adopted by the League of Nations for preventing and combating diseases, including diseases of plants and animals.

ARTICLE 21

The mandatory shall see that from the date of the coming into force of this mandate, and will ensure the execution of a law of antiquities in accordance with the provisions of article 421 of Part XIII of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey. The mandatory shall replace the former Ottoman Law of Antiquities, and shall ensure equality of treatment in the matter of archaeological research to the nationals of all States Members of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 22

Arabic, Hebrew and English shall be the official languages of Palestine. Any laws or regulations in Arabic or Hebrew or money in Palestine shall be repeated in English, and any statements or inscriptions in Hebrew shall be repeated in Arabic.

ARTICLE 23.

The Administration of Palestine shall recognise the holy days of the respective religious communities in Palestine as legal days of rest for the members of such communities.

ARTICLE 24

The mandatory shall make to the Council of the League of Nations an annual report on the progress of the administration of Palestine under the provisions of this mandate. Copies of all laws and regulations promulgated or issued during the year shall be communicated with the report.

ARTICLE 25.

In the territories lying between the Jordan and the eastern boundary of Palestine as ultimately determined, the mandatory shall be entitled to postpone or withhold the execution of such provisions of this mandate as he may consider inapplicable to the existing local conditions, and to make such provision for the administration of the territories as he may consider suitable to those conditions, provided no action shall be taken which is inconsistent with the provisions of articles 15, 16 and 18.

ARTICLE 20

If any dispute whatever should arise between the members of the League of Nations relating to the interpretation or the application of these provisions which may be referred to the Court of International Justice provided for by article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 21

The consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for any modification of the terms of this mandate.

ARTICLE 22

In the event of the termination of the mandate conferred upon the mandatory by this declaration the Council of the League of Nations shall make such arrangements as may be deemed necessary for safeguarding in perpetuity, under guarantee of the League, the rights secured by articles 13 and 14, and for securing, under the guarantee of the League, that the Government of Palestine will fully honour the financial obligations, legitimately incurred by the Administration of Palestine during the period of the mandate, including the rights of public servants to pensions or gratuities.

The present copy shall be deposited in the archives of the League of Nations. Certified copies shall be forwarded by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to all members of the League.

Made at _____ the _____ day of _____

Enclosure 2 in No. 255

Treaty with the United States of America respecting Palestine.

WHEREAS by the Treaty of Peace with Turkey, Turkey renounces all her rights and titles over Palestine;

Whereas article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations in the Treaty of Versailles provides that in the case of certain territories, which as a consequence of the late war ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them, mandates should be issued, and that the terms of the mandate should be explicitly defined in each case by the Council of the League; and

Whereas by article 23 of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey the high contracting parties agreed to entrust, by application of the provisions of the said article, the administration of Palestine, within such boundaries as might be determined by the Principal Allied Powers, to a mandatory to be selected by the said Powers, and further agreed that the mandatory should be responsible for putting into effect the declaration originally made on the 2nd November, 1917, by the British Government and adopted by the other Allied Powers in favour of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which might prejudice the civil or religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country; and

Whereas the terms of the said mandate have been defined by the Council of the League of Nations as follows:

Terms of Mandate

And—

Whereas the mandate in the above terms will be issued on the coming into force of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey; and

Whereas the United States of America by participating in the war against Germany contributed to the defeat of her and her allies, and to the renunciation of the rights and titles of her allies in the territory transferred by them, but has not ratified the Covenant of the League of Nations embodied in the Treaty of Versailles; and

Whereas the President of the United States is desirous of concurring in the British mandate for Palestine; and

Whereas His Britannic Majesty as mandatory for Palestine is desirous of ensuring to the United States of America and its citizens the same rights in Palestine as they would enjoy if the United States were a member of the League of Nations.

His Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States of America have decided to conclude a convention to this effect, and have authorized as their plenipotentiaries:

Who have agreed as follows—

ARTICLE 1

Subject to the provisions of the present convention the United States of America shall have and enjoy the benefit of all the rights and titles which the United States of America has acquired in the mandate for Palestine and the eastern boundary of Palestine as ultimately determined, and in the British administration of Palestine pursuant to the terms of the said mandate.

ARTICLE 2

The United States and its nationals shall have and enjoy the benefit of all the rights and titles which the United States of America has acquired in the mandate for Palestine, equality as regards commercial opportunity notwithstanding the fact that the United States is not a member of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 3

Vested American property rights in Palestine shall be respected and in no way impaired.

ARTICLE 4

A duplicate of the annual report to be made by the mandatory under article 24 of the mandate shall be furnished to the United States.

ARTICLE 5

Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate as created above, unless such modification is approved by the Council of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 6

The present convention shall be ratified in accordance with the respective constitutional methods of the high contracting parties. The ratifications shall be exchanged in London as soon as practicable. It shall take effect on the date of the exchange of the ratifications. If at the date when the convention is taken into effect the United States of America is not a member of the League of Nations, the convention shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this convention, and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate at _____ this _____ day of _____

Enclosure 3 in No. 255.

Projet de Traité avec les Etats-Unis relatif au Mandat sur la Syrie et le Liban,
le 6 Juin 1922

CONSIDERANT que par le Traité de Paix conclu avec les Puissances alliées et associées, la Syrie et le Liban ont été placés sous le mandat britannique; et

Considérant que par l'article 22 du Traité de Versailles il a été stipulé que les territoires sous mandat de la Société des Nations doivent être administrés conformément aux principes définies par le Conseil de la Société des Nations;

Considérant que les principales Puissances alliées ont convenu que la France exercerait le mandat sur la Syrie et le Liban;

Considérant que les termes de ce mandat ont été définis comme suit par le Conseil de la Société des Nations:

Texte du mandat

Considérant que le mandat dont les termes viennent d'être reproduits sera promulgué au moment de l'entrée en vigueur du Traité de Paix avec la Turquie;

Considérant que les États-Unis d'Amérique, en participant à la guerre contre l'Allemagne, ont contribué à sa défaite et à celle de ses Alliés et à la renonciation par ses Alliés à leurs droits et titres sur les territoires transférés par eux, mais et que les États-Unis n'ont pas ratifié le Pacte de la Société des Nations incorporé dans le Traité de Versailles;

Considérant que le Président des États-Unis a déclaré, par la France du mandat sur la Syrie et le Liban;

Considérant que, en qualité de Puissance mandataire pour la Syrie et le Liban, le Gouvernement de la République française désire assurer aux États-Unis d'Amérique et à leurs citoyens les mêmes droits en Syrie et au Liban dont ils jouissent en les États-Unis étaient membres de la Société des Nations;

A cet effet, le Président de la République française et le Président des États-Unis d'Amérique ont décidé de conclure une convention et ont désigné pour leurs plénipotentiaires

ARTICLE 1^{er}.

Sous réserve des dispositions de la présente convention, les États-Unis se déclarent mandataires pour la Syrie et le Liban et y exercent l'administration conformément aux termes dudit mandat.

ARTICLE 2.

Les États-Unis et leurs nationaux auront le bénéfice de tous les engagements pris par la France aux termes de ce mandat, y compris les engagements concernant l'égalité économique, sans qu'y puisse faire obstacle le fait que les États-Unis ne sont pas membres de la Société des Nations.

ARTICLE 3.

Il est également convenu que les droits de propriété américains en Syrie et au Liban seront respectés et protégés.

ARTICLE 4.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

ARTICLE 5.

Aucune modification qui affecterait les droits résultant de la présente convention ne sera apportée sans l'assentiment des États-Unis aux termes du mandat ci-dessus reproduit.

ARTICLE 6.

La présente convention sera ratifiée et les ratifications échangées le plus tôt possible. Elle prendra effet du jour de l'échange des ratifications. Au cas où, à la date où elle prendra effet, le mandat n'aurait pas encore été déclaré par le Conseil de la Société des Nations, le Gouvernement de la République française s'engage à présenter autant que possible, avant la première session du Conseil de la Société des Nations, un rapport sur le mandat à la demande du Conseil de la Société des Nations.

En foi de quoi

Enclosure 4 in No. 255.

Modifications proposées au Texte déposé à la Société des Nations le 1^{er} Décembre 1920

Proposition tendant à l'Approbation des Termes du Mandat pour la Syrie et le Liban

Preamble

CONSIDÉRANT que, par l'article du Traité de Paix avec la Turquie signé à Sèvres, la Turquie a renoncé, en faveur des principales Puissances alliées, à tous ses droits et titres sur les territoires de l'ancien Empire ottoman situés au sud de la Méditerranée orientale de la Turquie telle qu'elle est fixée au Traité de Sèvres;

Considérant que, par l'article dudit traité, les hautes parties contractantes ont agréé que la partie desdits territoires dénommée Syrie soit soumise à l'article 22, alinéa 4, du Pacte de la Société des Nations, constitué en France;

Considérant que, par l'article dudit traité, les hautes parties contractantes ont agréé que la partie desdits territoires dénommée Liban soit soumise à l'article 22, alinéa 4, du Pacte de la Société des Nations, constitué en France;

Considérant que, par l'article dudit traité, les hautes parties contractantes ont agréé que la partie desdits territoires dénommée Syrie et Liban soit soumise à l'article 22, alinéa 4, du Pacte de la Société des Nations, constitué en France;

Considérant que, par l'article dudit traité, les hautes parties contractantes ont agréé que la partie desdits territoires dénommée Syrie et Liban soit soumise à l'article 22, alinéa 4, du Pacte de la Société des Nations, constitué en France;

Considérant que, par l'article dudit traité, les hautes parties contractantes ont agréé que la partie desdits territoires dénommée Syrie et Liban soit soumise à l'article 22, alinéa 4, du Pacte de la Société des Nations, constitué en France;

Considérant que, par l'article dudit traité, les hautes parties contractantes ont agréé que la partie desdits territoires dénommée Syrie et Liban soit soumise à l'article 22, alinéa 4, du Pacte de la Société des Nations, constitué en France;

Considérant que, par l'article dudit traité, les hautes parties contractantes ont agréé que la partie desdits territoires dénommée Syrie et Liban soit soumise à l'article 22, alinéa 4, du Pacte de la Société des Nations, constitué en France;

Le Conseil de la Société des Nations approuve les termes du mandat pour la Syrie et le Liban.

Article 5.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Il sera remis aux États-Unis un texte authentique du rapport annuel à présenter par le mandataire conformément à l'article 17 du mandat.

Article 10

1000000

A handwritten musical score for the song "The Rose Tree". The score is written on five staves. The first staff is the vocal melody, starting with a treble clef and a key signature of one flat (B-flat). The second staff is the piano accompaniment, starting with a bass clef. The third staff is a second vocal melody, also in treble clef. The fourth and fifth staves are piano accompaniment, both in bass clef. The music is written in a cursive, handwritten style. The lyrics "The Rose Tree" are written below the staves. The score is a single system, meaning it is intended to be played through once without repeats.

pour les ressortissants des Etats qui rattacheraient entièrement ou partiellement à ce

No. 256.

Mr Churchill to Sir P Coz (Bagdad) — (Communicated to Foreign Office, June 10)

(Telegraphic.) P

YOUR telegram of 5th May.

His Majesty's Government are by no means indifferent, but their attitude as defined in my telegram No. 311 and previous correspondence is governed by following considerations:

the question His Majesty's Government has given no guarantee that he will not be the aggressor and is quite as likely to provoke disturbance as Ibn Saud. Ibn Saud, on the other hand, has promised that provided he is not attacked he will refrain from hostilities. The only hold His Majesty's Government have over Ibn Saud is that

vey a message to Ibn Saud in terms suggested by yourself, and you will see that I left off with a telegram that a warning is being addressed to Hussein as pilgrims you should concert with British agent, Jeddah, whether he is accompanied or not or both. Foreign office have communicated to me the contents of my telegram No. 314

No. 257.

Major Marshall to the Earl of Balfour.—(Received June 12.)

(Nu. 38.)

(telegraphic)

FOLLOWING addressed to Baghdad :-

"Your telegram No. 278 (S)

* Interviewed King Hussein to-day and gave him His Majesty's Government's warning about Nejd pilgrimage

first he agreed to accept them provided that they were villagers and not nomads, and they came via Medina in separate caravans of not more than 500 camels each, and not in one large party.

"I said that I could send a Moslem official to meet pilgrims, but he replied that if above procedure, which I think is advisable, be carried out this would not be necessary. Afterwards he said that, 'that

Afterwards he said that all this was conditional on His Majesty's Government sending him four British aeroplanes and pilots to be under his orders during pilgrimage.

"I said that this was impossible. I presume that things must take their course. If possible, wire approximate numbers."

E 5891 248 911

No 25R

Major Marshall to the Earl of Ralfour. - (Received June

41

Adelphi, June 11, 1923

age, Emir Zaid into
will declare for Emir A
reigning or leaving Mecca on account of Saud
is no secret that Government will not accompany
who is expected to arrive at Mecca in about a m

2 4063 33, 85

No. 254

Treaty with the King of Iraq (Draft of June 18, 1922)

500

HIS Britannic Majesty of the one part, and His Majesty the King of Irak of the other part

Whereas His Britannic Majesty has recognised Faisal Ibn Hussein as King of the State of Irak and

Whereas His Majesty the King of Iraq considers that it is to the interests of Iraq and will conduce to its rapid advancement that he should enter into relations with His Britannic Majesty on the basis of alliance and

Whereas His Britannic Majesty is satisfied that the relations between himself and His Majesty the King of Iraq, and the relations between himself and any other means

For this purpose the high contracting parties have appointed as their plenipotentiaries

His Majesty the King and I send greetings to all British subjects and
to the Government of the United Kingdom and to the Government of India.
We are glad to hear that the King and Queen have been successful in their
visit to the United States and Canada.

We are also glad to hear that the King and Queen have been successful in their
visit to the United States and Canada.

Sir Abdurrahman, G.R.E. Naqib al Ashraf Bagdad.

Who, having communicated their full powers, found in good and due order.

ARTICLE 1

At the request of His Majesty the King of Iraq His Britannic Majesty under-
 takes, subject to the provisions of this treaty, to protect the State of Iraq.

11. The Majesty shall be represented in Irak by a High Commissioner and
 ... al assisted by the necessary staff, without prejudice to the right of
 national sovereignty.

[8975]

ARTICLE 2

His Majesty the King of Irak undertakes that, for the period of the present treaty, no gazetted official of other than Irak nationality shall be appointed in Irak without the concurrence of His Britannic Majesty. A separate agreement shall determine the numbers and conditions of employment of British officials so appointed.

ARTICLE 3

His Majesty the King of Irak agrees to frame an organic law for presentation to the Constitutional Assembly of Irak and to give effect to the said law, which shall ensure to all complete freedom of conscience and the free exercise of all forms of worship, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals. It shall provide that no discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Irak on the ground of race, religion or language, and shall secure that each community to maintain its own schools for the education of its own children in its own language while conforming to such educational requirements as the Government of Irak may impose, shall not be denied or impaired. It shall prescribe the constitutional procedure, whether legislative or executive, by which decisions will be taken on all matters of importance including those involving questions of fiscal, financial and military policy.

ARTICLE 4

Without prejudice to the provisions of article 17 of this treaty, His Majesty the King of Irak agrees to be guided by the advice of His Britannic Majesty tendered through the High Commissioner on all important matters affecting the international obligations and interests of His Britannic Majesty for the whole period of the treaty. His Majesty the King of Irak will fully consult (or pay due regard to the advice of) the High Commissioner on what is conducive to a sound financial and fiscal policy, and will ensure the permanence and good organisation of the finances of the Irak Government so long as that Government is under financial obligations to the Government of His Britannic Majesty.

ARTICLE 5

His Majesty the King of Irak shall have the right of representation in London and such other capitals and places as may be agreed upon by the high contracting parties. Where His Majesty the King of Irak is not represented he agrees to authorise the protection of the interests of Irak nationals to His Britannic Majesty. His Majesty the King of Irak shall himself issue exequaturs to representatives of foreign Powers in Irak after His Britannic Majesty has agreed to their appointment.

ARTICLE 6

His Britannic Majesty undertakes to use his good offices to secure the admission of Irak to membership of the League of Nations as soon as possible.

ARTICLE 7

His Britannic Majesty undertakes to provide such support and assistance to the armed forces of His Majesty the King of Irak as may from time to time be agreed by the high contracting parties. A separate agreement regulating the extent and conditions of such support and assistance shall be concluded between the high contracting parties and communicated to the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 8

No territory in Irak shall be ceded or leased or in any way placed under the control of any foreign Power: this shall not prevent His Majesty the King of Irak from making such arrangements as may be necessary for the accommodation of foreign representatives, and for the fulfilment of the provisions of the preceding article.

ARTICLE 9

His Majesty the King of Irak undertakes that he will accept and give effect to such reasonable provisions as His Britannic Majesty may consider necessary in judicial matters to safeguard the interests of foreigners in consequence of the suspension (or non-application) of the immunities and privileges enjoyed by them under capitulation or usage. These provisions shall be embodied in a separate agreement which shall be communicated to the Council of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 10

His Britannic Majesty shall ensure the execution of any treaties, agreements or undertakings which His Britannic Majesty is under obligation to see carried out in respect of Irak. His Majesty the King of Irak undertakes to bring any legislation necessary to ensure the execution of such agreements shall be communicated to the Council of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 11

There shall be no discrimination in Irak against the nationals of any State, which is a member of the League of Nations, or against the companies incorporated under the laws of such State, as compared with British nationals or those of any foreign State in matters concerning taxation, commerce or navigation, the exercise of industries or professions. There shall be no discrimination in Irak against goods originating in or destined for any of the said States. There shall be freedom of transit under equitable conditions across Irak territory.

ARTICLE 12

No person shall be persecuted or to discriminate against any missionary on the ground of his religious beliefs or his race, or on the ground of his political opinions or his good government.

ARTICLE 13

His Majesty the King of Irak undertakes to co-operate in so far as social, economic and financial matters are concerned, with the measures adopted by the League of Nations for preventing and combating diseases, including diseases of plants and animals.

ARTICLE 14

His Majesty the King of Irak undertakes to secure the enactment of a law of antiquities based on the contents of article 421 of part XIII of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey. This law shall replace the former Ottoman law of antiquities, and shall ensure equality of treatment in the matter of archaeological research to the nationals of all States, members of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 15

A separate agreement shall regulate the financial relations between the High Commissioner and the Government of Irak, and between the Government of Irak and the Government of Irak of such works of public utility as may be agreed upon, and for the rendering by His Britannic Majesty's Government of such financial assistance as may from time to time be considered necessary for Irak, and on the other hand for the progressive liquidation by the Government of Irak of all liabilities thus incurred. Such agreement shall be communicated to the Council of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 16

So far as is consistent with his international obligations His Britannic Majesty shall co-operate with such neighbouring Arab States as may desire it, in the matter of customs or other purposes.

ARTICLE 17

Any difference that may arise between the high contracting parties as to the interpretation of the provisions of this treaty shall be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague. In such case, should there be any discrepancy between the English and Arabic texts of this treaty, the English shall be taken as the authoritative version.

ARTICLE 18

This treaty shall come into force as soon as it has been ratified by the high contracting parties, and shall remain in force for twenty years, at the end of which period the situation shall be examined, and if the (or, possibly, either or both of the) high contracting parties are of opinion that the treaty is no longer required it shall, subject to the assent of (or, possibly, confirmation by) the League of Nations, be terminated. Nothing shall prevent the high contracting parties from reviewing from time to time the provisions of this treaty and those of the separate agreements arising out of articles 7, 10 and 15 with a view to any revision which may seem desirable in the circumstances then existing and any modification which may be agreed upon by the high contracting parties shall be communicated to the League of Nations.

E 6011 78 65,

No. 260

Colonial Office to Foreign Office.—(Received June 14)

Sir,
I AM directed by Mr. Secretary Churchill to acknowledge the letter of the 8th June, 1922, regarding the note addressed to the French Ambassador on the subject of the Palestine mandate. Your Lordship's information that Mr. Churchill concurs in the terms of the proposed reply I am, &c.
G. GRINDLE

E 6037/248 91

No. 261

Major Marshall to the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston (Received June 15.)

(No. 34)
My Lord,
Jeddah, May 22 1922
WITH reference to my telegram No. 32 of to day's date on the subject of the Nejd pilgrimage, I have the honour to enclose my letter of the 18th instant, and from the Minister for Foreign Affairs. As I stated in my telegram No. 30 of the 18th instant, the districts of Qassim and Zarhan have joined the Mudayyana. While the sheiks of these districts were in Mecca Sultan-ul-Din, one of the chiefs of the Atashah, Bin Attayan, Emir of Buda and Khalid, Emir of Khurma, with 1,500 men, visited these districts, burnt villages in Ghassid and imposed a fine of 15,000 reals on the inhabitants, who have in consequence joined the ranks of the Mudayyana. In the north repeated rumours are received of the occupation of Madain Saleh by the Mudayyana. It is interesting to note in this connection that Mr. Philby reports the presence of Mudayyana as far north as Kaf in the Wadi Sirhan.

There is considerable danger attendant on this movement. The tribes are afraid of the Mudayyana, and would rather join them than resist, and the possibility of the movement spreading rapidly throughout the Hedjaz must be kept in view. This will be a peculiarly fruitful source of trouble and pillage.

It seems essential that some treaty should be settled between King Hussein and Ibn Saud if this country is to remain safe for foreign pilgrims. King Hussein and the Minister for Foreign Affairs both state that, so long as there is any danger to these pilgrims the Nejd pilgrims should not come by land. In this I concur. For this reason I recommend that, if possible, the Nejd land pilgrimage should be stopped this

* Not printed

year, and that further efforts be made after the pilgrimage to make peace between King Hussein and Ibn Saud and to settle the boundaries between their respective kingdoms. In view of the fact that there are now approximately 30,000 foreign pilgrims in the Hedjaz it would be unwise, in my opinion, to run the risk of hostilities during this year's pilgrimage.

Owing to the spread of Mudayyana in the north, I think it would be advisable to hasten on the repairs of the Hedjaz Railway, so that communication may be restored between Medina and Transjordan. From reports received it appears that Medina is in a bad way, and many of the inhabitants would welcome the Mudayyana instead of the present Government. Emir Ali is still at Bneir.

A copy of this despatch is being sent to His Excellency the High Commissioner for Iraq.

I have, &c.

W. E. MARSHALL

British Agent and Consul

E 6040 4453 91

No. 262

Major Marshall to the Earl of Balfour.—(Received June 15.)

(No. 45)

My Lord,

Jeddah, May 29, 1922.

WITH reference to your Lordship's despatch No. 39 of the 9th instant, relative to traffic in the Hedjaz, I have the honour to inform your Lordship that, in my opinion, the Government of the Hedjaz cannot fail to remove from these negotiations any prospect of a successful issue.

The system of slavery on the social and domestic life of the Hedjaz and the relations here existing between slaves and their owners are a subject of which I have written a volume of his work (London, 1888). King Hussein is a very humane man, and it will be as difficult to

his social tradition as to convince him that any practical advantage will result from its abolition. The task of reminding him that this inhuman trade is universally regarded as a disgrace to any enlightened community will not be rendered easier by the circumstance that the Italian representative keeps a native concubine imported from Entree, while a Dutch (European) doctor recently established in Jeddah purchased an Abyssinian slave-girl in November last for the sum of 700.

I enclose copies of correspondence which passed between this agency and the Government of the Hedjaz. I recommend that I may be permitted to endeavour to obtain from King Hussein some such expression of disapproval of the system of slave traffic as will be sufficient for the activity of His Majesty's ships in the Red Sea, whether they are or not, without making this pronouncement an essential condition of the ratification of the Abdullah Lawrence Treaty. It is also a subject of which I have written a volume of his work (London, 1888). His Majesty's Government are aware of the fact that the system of slave traffic is a source of trouble and pillage, and it is a subject of frequent reference in the Abdullah Lawrence negotiations.

I have, &c.

W. E. MARSHALL, Major R.A.M.C.

British Agent and Consul.

'Translation.'

January 21, 1922

steering towards the anchorage to the north of Jeddah.

This has been done under the pretext of searching for slaves. The umbuka were then not free as nothing of the above has been found.

As both the slaves and their traffic are free of these regions should prohibit the traffic without such disturbances of mind.

This is proved by the fact that slaves are 100% in the hands of the world bearing of British steamers' control, as is the case with us.

Carrying of slaves from these regions is proved by their arrival

it has been pointed out that the trouble resulting from that is very harmful to Great Britain.

case one of those neglected cases which we meet, and which are only due to the personal misfortune of His Majesty my Lord

Other letters have been
 received.

(For Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs),
SADAOA

Enclosure 2 in No. 264

Setting British Agent to Hashimite Government

After reports,

Երեւան, Բեքարյու

With reference to your letter of the 21st ultimo, I have the honour to inform you that I have been advised by Mr. A. C. Galloway, with whom I discussed the matter and to the north of Jeridub or elsewhere except in the case of the above "Maun". No. 1001 of Season and then in 1915 after her crew had fired twice upon her ship.

As to the question of slaves, I am interested in your views on the importation into the Hedjaz by land, from the coasts of Africa by way of Mide. I have just recommended that the Governments of the regions of Africa concerned should be asked to stop it. On the other hand, if the importation is by sea, one point, it cannot be wrong to stop it at another.

Flushmote Government depends the encouragement or otherwise of the traders' ho-
ne profit in the Hodge.

Britain is permitting warships to smuggle arms and ammunition to parts of the coast of the country. Please refer me to your previous complaint as regards this matter.

The suggestion made in the last paragraph of your letter is justified by nothing in the history of your relations with this agency. This you know.

Compliments.

L. B. GRAFFTEY-SMITH,
Acting British Agent and Consul.

B 6042 656 911

No. 263

Major Marshall to the Earl of Balfour.--(Received June 15.)

(No. 47. Secret.)

My Lord,

Jeddah, May 31, 1932

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith the Jeddah report for the period 11th-31st May, 1922

Copies of this report and despatch have been sent to Cairo, Bagdad, Jerusalem, Transjordan, Aden, Sindh and Damascus.

I have, &c

W E MARSHALL, Major, R A M
British Agent and Consul

Enclosure 1 in No. 6.

Jedidah Report, May 11-31, 1922

(Secret)

As I have already mentioned, N. 100, 1 May 1891, the Emir of Bisha, Bin Atiyan, an Emir of Bisha and Khalid, Emir of Khurma, with 1,600 men, visited these districts, burnt villages in Ghannid and imposed a fine of 15,000 reals on the inhabitants. They captured and imprisoned Ibn Aweidan and Ibn Rayash, two sons of the Zahran. In consequence of this expedition, the tribes of these two districts have joined the Mudayyana. As this threatens Kunsuda and, to a certain extent, Kunsuda, more is consideration necessary in Mecca at the spread of this Mudayyana movement. So far as I know, the shukla of these districts are still in the hands of the Emir of Bisha. A number of the Ghannid people have arrived in Mecca bearing letters to the King from some of the shukla. In these letters they say that they have captured Khalid and Bin Atiyan, and that they await the King's orders. King Hassan has not yet received these letters, but he has sent some of his own to the Emir of Bisha.

In the north, Parthian-of-Aids is in open revolt against the King, and there are repeated rumours, still unconfirmed, that the Mudayyana have captured Meidan Saleh. Emir Ali is still at Bueir. It is stated that he wished to withdraw his headquarters to Medina, but the King sent him instructions to remain at Huer, as he was sending reinforcements and ammunition. Machine guns and ammunition left for Yonbu on the Hedjaz Co. steamer "Rusudi" and have been sent to Huer.

1. I find that the Mudayyan influence is predominant all round Medina, and that Emir Ali is in a very difficult position. At Kheibar it is said that the Mudayyans hold the town while the Karamkars of K. P. Shah, Ali Wazir, ~~now are~~ are out in the name of the King. His conduct, however, is not above suspicion, and it is suggested that he has been converted to Mudayyanism and that he returns in the fort as a hint for Emir Ali to attack Kheibar. Sharif Shabat, the Karamkar of Medina, whose influence in and around Medina is very great in spite of his dissolute habits, is with Emir Ali at Boer. It is said that the Mudayyans have offered him the post of Governor of Medina when they take that town.

Fear of the Mudayyana and a desire to placate them at all costs are ruling passions round Medina. Only the tribes between Medina and Yenbu and between Yenbu and Jeddah are as yet untainted, and that because they have not yet come into contact with the promethians.

The *Mudharyyans* are the combative promoters of the Wahhabi movement.

Conditions in Medina are bad. There is great scarcity of fuel, and foodstuffs are very expensive owing to the high cost of camel hire between Medina and Yembo.

6140001

Red Sea Shipping.—The purchase of the two small steamers has been completed; the smaller of the two, the "Rushdi," has made trips to Yembo and to Kufufu.

Quarantine.—The Hashemite Government have at last come to a decision with
"Dispositions applicables aux Pèlerins et aux Natives à Pèlerinage pendant le Pèlerinage"

[4975]

6. I am to request that copies of the draft treaty in its final form may be communicated to this Department in due course.

255

Foreign Office, June 16, 1922

2. As the terms of the mandate are to be recited in the treaty, the latter cannot, however, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government be signed until the terms of the mandate have been definitely settled by the Council of the League of Nations.

I have, too.

HAIR POLISH

No. 268

(No. 987.)

Foreign Office, June 20, 1914

Department of State, will ascertain whether they agree to its terms, and, if not, what modifications they consider desirable.

State Department that His Majesty's Government are not contemplating any modifications of substance in the text of the mandate, except for the insertion in article 25 of the phrase "with the consent of the League of Nations" between the words "be entitled" and "to postpone," and except for some modification of article 14, as to which a separate despatch is being addressed to you.

EXERCISES

Draft Treaty with the United States of America.

Publications

Whereas article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations in the Treaty of Versailles provides that in the case of certain territories which, as a consequence of the

parties agreed to entrust, by application of the provisions of the said article 22, the administration of Palestine, within such boundaries as might be determined by the principal Allied Powers, to a mandatory to be selected by the said Powers, and further

Whereas the principal Allied Powers have agreed to entrust the mandate for

Whereas the terms of the said mandate have been defined by the Council of the League of Nations as follows:—

[Term of Mandate]

And whereas the mandate in the above terms will be issued on the 30th day of

to the President of the United States is desirous of concurring in the
to candidate for Palestine, and

Wbca

have agreed as follows:-

ARTICLE L

Subject to the provisions of the present convention, the United States concurs in the British mandate for Palestine, including the territories lying between the Jordan and the eastern boundary of Palestine as ultimately determined, and in the British administration of Palestine pursuant to the terms of the said mandate.

ARTICLE 2

$$P_{\text{max}} = \frac{1}{2} \rho c v^2 A$$

Abstract

Vested American property rights in Palestine shall be respected and in no way impaired.

ARTICLE 4

A duplicate of the annual report to be made by the mandatory under article 14 :

ARTICLE 3

Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the Convention of 1902, provided that such modification shall have been assented to by the United States.

ARTICLE 8

The present convention shall be ratified in accordance with the respective constitutional methods of the high contracting parties. The ratifications shall be exchanged in London as soon as practicable. It shall take effect on the date of the exchange of the ratifications. If at the date when the convention takes effect the mandate has not yet been issued by the Council of the League of Nations, His Britannic Majesty agrees to apply the convention so far as may be possible in the provisional administration of Palestine which he is now conducting at the request of the Council of the League.

Whereof, the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this convention at London this 24th day of June 1922.

In duplicate at London, this 24th day of June 1922.

E 5858 78 65

No. 267

The Earl of Balfour to Sir G. Grahame, Brussels

(No. 650)

Sir,

Foreign Office

SINCE the last meeting of the Council of the League of Nations the terms of the Palestine mandate have been carefully examined by His Majesty's Government in connection with the points raised by the United States Government and in certain other respects.

As the result of correspondence with the Government of the United States, article 8 has been amended so as to read: "The immunities and privileges of foreigners, including the benefits of consular jurisdiction and protection as formerly enjoyed by capitulation or usage in the Ottoman Empire, are suspended in Palestine, but shall be revived immediately and completely upon the termination of the mandatory régime, unless the Powers whose nationals were entitled on the 1st August, 1914, to such rights should agree, or have agreed, by treaty to their suspension or modification."

In the case of article 14, regarding which a separate despatch will be published in August 1922, occur in the final draft of the mandate for Palestine, as published in August 1921, occur in the case of article 25 the words "with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations" have been inserted between the words "shall be entitled" and "to postpone."

Article 27 now reads: "The consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for any modification of the terms of this mandate," and in the concluding sentence of article 28 the words "members of the League" have been substituted for the words "Powers signatories of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey."

I shall be glad if your Excellency will inform M. Hymans of these modifications, and at the same time communicate to him one of the enclosed copies of the draft treaty which it is hoped to conclude with the Government of the United States as soon as the terms of the mandate have been approved by the Council of the League of Nations. It has been sent to His Majesty's Ambassador at Washington with instructions to open negotiations with the Department of State.

I am, &c.

BALFOUR

E 5858 78 65

No. 268

The Earl of Balfour to Baron Hayashi

Your Excellency,

Foreign Office, June 20, 1922.

AT the recent session of the Council of the League of Nations it was decided that a special meeting of that body should be called in July to consider the "A" plan.

2. Meanwhile His Majesty's Government have been considering the points raised by the United States Government and observations made in other quarters regarding the text of the draft mandate for Palestine, and the following modifications have now been made in the final draft of the mandate for Palestine, as published by His Majesty's Government in August 1921:

* See enclosure in No. 266.

been made in the final draft of the mandate for Palestine, as published by His Majesty's Government in August 1921.

(1.) Article 8 now reads: "The immunities and privileges of foreigners, including the benefits of consular jurisdiction and protection as formerly enjoyed by capitulation or usage in the Ottoman Empire, are suspended in Palestine, but shall be revived immediately and completely upon the termination of the mandatory régime, unless the Powers whose nationals were entitled on the 1st August, 1914, to such rights should agree, or have agreed, by treaty to their suspension or modification."

(2.) In article 25 the phrase "with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations" has been inserted between the words "shall be entitled" and "to postpone."

(3.) Article 27 now reads: "The consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for any modification of the terms of this mandate."

(4.) In the concluding sentence of article 28 the words "members of the League" have been substituted for the words "Powers signatories of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey."

3. Of these modifications, the revision of article 8 has been made in connection with the agreement regarding the Palestine mandate which His Majesty's Government have reached with the Government of the United States with whom it is hoped to conclude a treaty as soon as possible.

The Council of the League of Nations will be asked to give its consent to His Majesty's Ambassador in connection with the Department of State negotiations with the Department of State.

4. No other modifications of substance are otherwise being made by His Majesty's Government for a revision of article 14, regarding which a separate despatch will be published in August 1922.

5. His Majesty's Government are anxious that the approval of the Council of the League for the mandate for Palestine should be obtained at the forthcoming session of the Council, and they confidently hope that in this object they will receive the support of the Japanese representative on that body.

6. I shall be glad if your Excellency will arrange for a copy of this note to be communicated to the Japanese Ambassador in Paris.

I have, &c.

BALFOUR

E 5858 78 65

No. 269

The Earl of Balfour to M. de Martino

Your Excellency,

Foreign Office, June 20, 1922.

AT the recent session of the Council of the League of Nations it was decided that a special meeting of that body should be called in July to consider the "A" plan.

2. Meanwhile His Majesty's Government have been considering the points raised by the United States Government and observations made in other quarters regarding the text of the draft mandate for Palestine, and the following modifications have now been made in the final draft of the mandate for Palestine, as published by His Majesty's Government in August 1921:

(1.) Article 8 now reads: "The immunities and privileges of foreigners, including the benefits of consular jurisdiction and protection as formerly enjoyed by capitulation or usage in the Ottoman Empire, are suspended in Palestine, but shall be revived immediately and completely upon the termination of the mandatory régime, unless the Powers whose nationals were entitled on the 1st August, 1914, to such rights should agree, or have agreed, by treaty to their suspension or modification."

(2.) In article 25 the phrase "with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations" has been inserted between the words "shall be entitled" and "to postpone."

* See enclosure in No. 266.

- (3.) Article 27 now reads: The consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for any modification of the terms of this mandate.
- (4.) In the concluding sentence of article 28 the words "members of the League" have been substituted for the words "Powers signatories of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey."

3. Of these modifications the revision of article 8 has been made in connection with the agreement regarding the Palestine mandate which His Majesty's Government have reached with the Government of the United States, with whom it is hoped to conclude a treaty as soon as the actual terms of the mandate have been approved by the Council of the League of Nations. A copy of the draft of this treaty, which has been sent to His Majesty's Ambassador at Washington with instructions to open negotiations with the Department of State, is transmitted herewith.

4. No other modifications of substance are otherwise being made by His Majesty's Government. The question of the future of the Turkish Empire is being addressed to you.

5. His Majesty's Government are anxious that the approval of the Council of the League for the mandate for Palestine should be obtained at the forthcoming session of the Council, and they confidently hope that in this object they will receive the support of the Italian representative on that body.

I have, &c.
BALFOUR

E 5858 78 651

No. 270

The Earl of Balfour to Count de Saint-Aulaire.

Your Excellency.

Foreign Office, June 20, 1922.

IN reply to your note of the 6th instant, I have the honour to state that His Majesty's Government cordially reciprocate the desire of the French Government to co-operate in securing the issue of the Palestine and Syrian mandates at the next session of the Council.

2. As your Excellency is doubtless aware the texts of the additions to the Syrian mandate and of the proposed treaty with the United States were considered in the course of the discussions on the "A" mandates which have taken place in Paris between M. Fromageot and Sir C. Hurst, who reached a general agreement on the subject. I now desire formally to confirm that agreement.

3. In the course of these discussions the view was expressed by the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs that the present text of article 25 of the Palestine mandate appeared to accord to the mandatory excessive liberty of action in Transjordan. The adoption of the new text for this article was primarily intended to give the mandatory the power to differentiate, in so far as the application of the measures connected with

zone between the Jordan and the eastern boundary of Palestine, as ultimately determined. His Majesty's Government are, however, anxious to meet the wishes of the French Government on this point, and are accordingly prepared to insert the phrase "with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations" between the words "shall be entitled" and "to postpone."

4. As regards the mandate for Iraq, it has been explained to M. Fromageot that His Majesty's Government will probably find themselves unable to proceed with that mandate at the forthcoming session of the Council of the League of Nations, since it is

Government of the validity of the rights claimed by the Turkish Petroleum Company which has been the subject of protracted correspondence.

5. The present text of the Iraq mandate is, however, unlikely to undergo any substantial modification beyond such as may be necessitated in the course of negotiations with the United States. It will, doubtless, eventually include provisions regarding the Capitulations similar to those to be added to the Syrian or Palestine mandates. When these negotiations are completed, His Majesty's Government cannot foresee what, if any, provisions regarding monopolies can be included in the Iraq mandate.

6. Certain minor textual changes may also have to be made in the Iraqman date as the result of the conclusion of the projected treaty with King Faisal, but it is anticipated that these will be confined to modifications by which the existing Iraq State is recognised, and His Majesty's Government, instead of undertaking to create a new State, will be required to recognise the existing one. It is proposed, for example, to substitute "Iraq" for "Mesopotamia" throughout, and to alter the first sentence of article 1 of the mandate for Iraq to read "The mandatory undertakes that an organic law shall be framed."

7. The texts of the mandates for Syria and Iraq are, however, already not identical, and His Majesty's Government are confident that the French Government will agree that the introduction into the latter of modifications of the nature indicated above is inevitable.

8. It is regretted that the final texts of the mandates for Iraq and Palestine, as issued in the summer of 1921, were not published at the time, and that the modifications which had been introduced as the result of their publication by His Majesty's Government in the white paper of August last, of which copies are understood to have been supplied in the usual course to the French Embassy here.

9. In conclusion, I have the honour to express the hope that the forthcoming negotiations between the French Government and the United States Government regarding the mandate for Syria will reach an early and satisfactory conclusion, and that the efforts in which our two Governments are collaborating to secure the approval by the Council of the League of Nations of the terms of the mandates for Syria and Palestine at the forthcoming session of that body may prove successful.

I have, &c.
BALFOUR

E 6037 248 911

No. 271

The Earl of Balfour to Major Marshall (Jeddah).

(No. 72.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, June 22, 1922.

WITH reference to your despatch No. 38 of the 22nd ultimo, I have to inform you that the question of the attitude to be adopted by His Majesty's Government in regard to the matter of the Nejd pilgrimages has, since the receipt of your despatch, been under consideration. It is respectfully suggested that His Majesty's Government should reflect that Ibn Saud was unlikely to be able for the time being to prevent his subjects from performing the pilgrimages, and that the matter should be considered under the most favourable conditions.

3. From the first, King Hussein has adopted in this question an entirely uncompromising attitude, which was in no way modified as the result of the receipt of your despatch. It is suggested that His Majesty's Government should consider the part of the Nejd if they were unopposed (see my telegram No. 23 of the 22nd May), which was conveyed to him at the same time as he was warned that he would probably travel overland.

3. Your telegram No. 30 and 32 laid stress on the spread of Madayynism and the danger to the pilgrimages. It is suggested that His Majesty's Government should consider that it was felt that His Majesty's Government would not be justified in pressing Ibn Saud once more to prevent his subjects from performing the pilgrimages. He might, though anxious to do so, be unable to restrain them and they would in that case probably set out in a provocative spirit and unfettered by any guarantee of non-interference. If, on the other hand, His Majesty's Government did not attempt to veto the pilgrimages, Ibn Saud's assurances would hold good and the responsibility for any unprovoked attacks which might be made by his pilgrims would fall entirely upon his shoulders. In any case, His Majesty's Government had no wish to find themselves directly involved in the threatening struggle between the Wahabism and the orthodox Moslems.

4. You were, therefore, instructed (see my telegram No. 23 of the 22nd May) to inform King Hussein that His Majesty's Government were unable to intervene further, Sir P. Cox being, however, subsequently authorised to urge Ibn Saud to limit the numbers of his pilgrims and to impress on him the serious light in which His Majesty's Government would view any further increase in the number of pilgrims. It is suggested that the result of his own or Khalid's actions (see my telegram No. 24 of the 6th June).

(8975)

3 4

5. The decisions communicated to you in my telegrams Nos. 27 and 28 were those reached at an inter-departmental conference on the 7th June attended by members of the Colonial Office and India Office, as well as of this Department, when recent telegrams from you and the Hashimite Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs were discussed in detail. The considerations which have led the Government to the attitude of non-interference are briefly summarised as follows:—

- (a) His Majesty's Government are not prepared to have recourse to military measures in order to keep the peace in Arabia.
- (b) The only ruler over whom they have a direct hold is Ibn Saud, to whom they pay a subsidy of 60,000*l.* per annum.
- (c) Ibn Saud has on the whole behaved well and has shown loyalty to His Majesty's Government. Moreover, of all the chieftains in Arabia he alone is shown signs of statesmanship.
- (d) To threaten him with a stoppage of his subsidy before he has taken any action to justify recourse to such a measure, and having regard to the fact that admittedly, His Majesty's Government are unable to guarantee that his followers may not be subjected to unprovoked attack, would be straining his friendship to the breaking point, and might have the effect of throwing him into the arms of the French, who are only too anxious to welcome him to their bosom.
- (e) To yield to Faisal's threat of leaving his throne in order to succour his family would only encourage him to adopt similar tactics, whenever he wishes to extort something from His Majesty's Government which they are unwilling to give.

6. The foregoing exposition of the trend of events at this end will show you that the fullest consideration was given to your recommendation that the Nejd pilgrimage by land should be prevented this year. Meanwhile, recent telegrams from Sir P. Cox indicate that Ibn Saud is anxious to discuss the question of a settlement with King Hussein, and that the Government are anxious to see that the pilgrimage of these potentates will not be prejudiced by any untoward incidents during the present pilgrimage.

I am, &c.
HALFOUR.

E 6298 65 65

No. 272

(No. 25.)

(Telegraphic.)

de Janeiro, June 23, 1922.

YOUR ALDO despatch No. 123 and your despatch No. 241, 1922.

Mr. Wilson is now here. Are you sending any instructions about representations to Brazilian Government?

E 6318/178/65]

No. 273

Mr. Dormer to the Earl of Balfour. — (Received June 25.)

(No. 25.)

(Telegraphic.)

the Vatican, June 24, 1922.

CARDINAL SECRETARY OF STATE, VATICAN. The Cardinal Secretary of State, who had called on Nuncio and made following proposal with regard to Palestine mandate and question of Holy Places.

Commission should consist of a representative of France, Great Britain, Italy and Spain, and perhaps Belgium. President was to be a Frenchman and a Catholic. The Commission would no doubt be agreed to by League of Nations. French Government would then insist on liturgical honours being paid to president. To this Nuncio had expressed surprise and pointed to San Remo agreement.

Cardinal Secretary of State remarked he felt post of president should be held by

each representative in turn and not permanently by a Frenchman. Holy See would not object to liturgical honours, but naturally they could only be paid to the Catholic. Belgium should certainly be represented. He said he had spoken in a similar sense to Spanish Ambassador.

I said commission now seemed to be something different to that referred to in article 14, which was more a tribunal to define rights. On the face of it, I did not see how question of honours came in. I had not heard of French proposal, and, as it stood, doubted it being acceptable in any quarter.

E 6385 78 65

No. 274

Sir R. Graham to the Earl of Balfour. — (Received June 26.)

My Lord,

Rome, June 21, 1922.

WITH reference to my despatches Nos. 518 and 559 of the 8th and 16th instant, I have the honour to report that the Syrian and Palestine mandates are becoming the subject of some attention on the part not only of the Catholic Popular Party, but also of the Fascist organisation.

Signor Mussolini has published a resolution in the name of the directorate of the Fascist parliamentary group defining its views as follows:—

1. In consequence of the lapse of the Treaty of Sévres, all mandates connected therewith and all questions of the Eastern Mediterranean are reopened for discussion.

2. The Italian representatives at the League must see that all mandates in violation of the principles of the independence and liberty of peoples, especially in the East.

3. The Italian representatives at the League must see that all mandates no longer having any legal foundation, which would inevitably lead to bloodshed, are not ratified or are postponed *sine die*.

4. The material and moral interests of Italy lie in favouring the constitution of independent or federated States in the Eastern Mediterranean as the sole escape from strangulation by French and English imperialism and for bringing about peaceful Italian commercial expansion among those peoples who have given proof of the warmest sympathy for Italy.

In a signed article in the "Popolo d'Italia" on the 16th June Signor Mussolini states that the issue of the Palestine mandate is apparently irreparably prejudiced in favour of France, and that the interests of Italy, of the Holy See, and of Italy, as Senator Schenker has explicitly admitted. What would happen if it is easy to see, in any case it is a veritable abuse of power—a fraud—since the Treaty of Sévres has lapsed. He then discusses at greater length the Syrian and Lebanon mandates. Syria and Lebanon were better off under Turkey, and are now in revolt against French military dictatorship and economic exploitation. The League had hitherto abetted English and French imperialism; it is the policy of France to make the Mediterranean practically a French sea. Leaving principles aside, is it to Italian interests to have an anglicised Palestine and a gallicised Syria? Let the Minister for Foreign Affairs take note that two powerful Italian parties—the Popular Party and the Fascists—had declared definitely against the ratification of the Anglo-French mandates, and let him act accordingly.

The directorate of the Popular Party, which, with its hundred odd members, is an essential element in the present Government's majority, has declared that Italy should insist on the principle of the independence of the Holy Places, and that Italy should guarantee for minorities. It also (re-examines) the question of the Holy Places, where Italy had glorious traditions and imprescriptible rights, especially for the Conventum.

I have, &c.

R. GRAHAM

E 6321/78 65]

No. 275.

Baron Moncheur to the Earl of Balfour.—(Received June 26.)

Ambassade de Belgique, Londres,
le 23 juin 1922.

Milord,

L'E. Conseil de la Société des Nations a décidé, au cours de sa session du mois de mai, d'examiner, en vue de son approbation définitive, le projet de mandat britannique sur la Palestine.

Comme ne l'ignore pas votre Seigneurie, ledit projet ne put être approuvé par suite de l'attitude prise par certaines Puissances. De son côté, le Saint-Siège exprima au Conseil de la Société des Nations, par l'intermédiaire d'une communication du Cardinal Gasparri, diverses observations au sujet dudit projet.

Il semble que cette action du Saint-Siège a ouvert l'ouverture de négociations entre le Vatican et la Grande-Bretagne au sujet des questions soulevées par le Vatican au sujet de la situation des catholiques de Palestine.

Le Gouvernement de la Belgique à la prochaine session du Conseil de la Société des Nations, sur les termes du mandat britannique. En outre, les représentants étrangers de Belgique estiment qu'il serait bon pour lui d'être mis au courant des pourparlers entre le Gouvernement britannique et le Vatican sur la cause la ligne de conduite du Gouvernement belge au sujet de la question dont il s'agit.

Je serais très reconnaissant à votre Seigneurie si elle voulait bien avoir l'obligeance de me mettre en mesure de satisfaire au désir de M. Jaspard de m'informer du résultat des négociations relatives au projet de mandat britannique sur la Palestine.

Je suis, &c.

Bx MONCHEUR.

E 6415/248/91]

No. 276

Colonial Office to Foreign Office.—(Received June 28.)

Sir,

Downing Street, June 27, 1922.

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to transmit to you, for the attention of the Foreign Office, a copy of a letter from the Political Agent, Bahrain, transmitting a personal message to Ibn Saud on the subject of the visit of Nejd pilgrims to Mecca.

I am, &c.

J. E. MASTERTON SMITH

Enclosure to No. 276.

Sir P. Cox to Political Agent, Bahrain.

(No. 647)

(Telegraphic.)

FOLLOWING for Ibn Saud —

Biydad, May 31, 1922

I am, Sir, in receipt of a personal message from me. Your agent, Ahmad Thanayan, and the political agent, Bahrain, were recently informed, from a view of their assurances of last year and of the guarantees which they gave to the British Government. His Majesty's Government have been debarred this year from undertaking the Hajj. You were also informed that similar guarantees of non-aggression were being demanded from King Hussein.

"I know that on the one hand this intimation would have given you a feeling of relief in that you would no longer be obliged to resist the importunities of your subjects to undertake the pilgrimage. On the other hand, I am sure that you will be anxious to prevent any dispute which might set like the small spark which ignites a great conflagration, of which no one can foresee the extent. Your Highness is well aware

that I have the strongest reliance on your personal good faith and loyalty to your engagements with Great Britain and you, I believe, place similar reliance on my great personal regard and friendship for yourself and my keen desire that your relations with the Government should remain firm and, similarly, that your relations of amity with the friends of my Government such as the State of Irak should be firmly established. I feel sure that you also will realise that the danger which gives me such anxiety is a real one and that, granting the most loyal intentions on your part and that of King Hussein to ensure that your subjects should perform their pilgrimage to the Holy Places in all friendliness and security, it can only be by the dint of very great precautions and most stringent orders on the part of both Governments that that can be assured. It is only now that I learn of the recent expedition of Khalid ibn Mansur into Ghazal, and his occupation of Mikhwah. This alone may well lead to trouble at this critical juncture. Had it been possible for you to discourage your subjects from going even for another year I think it would have been fortunate from the point of view of the unity of Islam and the peace of the Jemrat al-Arab, but I well understand that it may not now be possible for you to take such action and in that

circumstances both to reduce the numbers of your pilgrims to the lowest limit and to send with them representatives in whom you can place complete confidence and whom you can warn of the vital importance of demonstrating to the British Government that the world at large that your subjects are completely under your control and that

confidence is given for their good behaviour it can be accepted with complete confidence by those to whom it is given. I beg you also to remember that in the event of any disturbance of the peace of the Hedjaz owing to the influx of your subjects, the responsibility for not preventing it will certainly be laid at the door of Great Britain.

I need not say that our agents in the Hedjaz will similarly do their utmost to assist King Hussein to fulfil his obligation and to ensure that your subjects receive just and friendly treatment as the pilgrims of other nations. The mere fact that the Hedjaz at this time is full of subjects of all nations occupied with the pilgrimage will doubtless bring home to you the more forcibly how vitally important it is that nothing

E 6318 178 65]

No. 277

The Earl of Balfour to Mr. Dornier (The Vatican).

(No. 14.)

(Telegraphic.)

Foreign Office, June 29, 1922

YOUR telegram No. 25 of 24th June: the Holy Places Commission.

(Confidential.)

His Majesty's Government are considering a possible modification of article 14 of the Mandate for Palestine. In the event of such a modification being adopted, you should confine yourself to denying the correctness of the views expressed by M. Gout. His Majesty's Government have said nothing to give any colour whatever to his assertion that his proposal was acceptable to them.

E 6298 65 65]

No. 278

The Earl of Balfour to Sir J. Tilley (Rio de Janeiro).

(No. 90.)

(Telegraphic.)

Foreign Office, June 29, 1922

YOUR telegram No. 90 of 23rd June: Palestine mandate. Modification of article 14 of Palestine mandate and assurances regarding method of appointing commission are under consideration here with a view to remove misapprehensions entertained by Vatican and other quarters. Representations will be made to Brazilian Ambassador here.

E 8068 78 65

No 279

The Earl of Balfour to Mr. Chilton (Washington)

(No. 1033.)

Sir,

With reference to your letter of the 14th June, I have to say that the Government of His Majesty the King are taking the action which His Majesty's Government are taking, as explained above. You should at the same time point out to him how unfounded are the apprehensions which have been expressed in certain quarters on this subject.

I am, &c.
BALFOUR.

E 8068 78 65

No 280

The Earl of Balfour to Count de Salis (Vatican)

(No. 148.)

Sir,

I have received your despatch No. 38 of the 18th April enclosing a copy of a memorandum concerning the draft mandate for Palestine.

2. As a result of the meeting which you attended in Sir C. Hays's room in the Foreign Office on the 14th June, and at which representatives of the Colonial Office were present, it has been decided that a reply should be prepared by the Colonial Office to the memorandum (practically identical with that enclosed in your above-mentioned despatch) which the Vatican recently addressed to the Council of the League of Nations. This reply will be made direct to the Council for purposes of circulation to the members of the League by that body, and an advance copy is enclosed for your personal information.

3. I shall be glad if you will return to your post at as early a date as possible and explain to the Cardinal Secretary of State the action which His Majesty's Government are taking, as explained above. You should at the same time point out to him how unfounded are the apprehensions which have been expressed in certain quarters regarding the policy of His Majesty's Government.

4. You may at the same time discuss with Cardinal Gasparri the draft article which His Majesty's Government intend to propose to the Council of the League in connection with the proposed Holy Land Commission. It is important to make fully the intentions of His Majesty's Government with regard to the proposed Holy Land Commission. It is important to make State that the name of a Roman Catholic will be included among those actually put forward for approval by the Council of the League of Nations.

5. Your conversation should throughout take the form of explaining to the Cardinal Secretary of State the lines of the reply of His Majesty's Government to the Council of the League of Nations. In view of the facts that none of the enclosures to this despatch has yet been published and that the memorandum to the League has not yet been sent, it is important to make it clear that the Government of His Majesty the King are taking the action which His Majesty's Government are taking, as explained above.

* See Enclosure to No. 281

them, except the new draft of article 14, to the Cardinal Secretary of State, but there is no objection to your handing to him unofficially a copy of the letter to the League of Nations. I may add, for your information, that copies of the new draft of article 14 have been communicated to the French, Italian, Japanese, Spanish, Belgian, Brazilian, and Chinese representatives in London, and to His Majesty's Ambassador at Washington for communication to the United States Government.

6. You should report in due course the result of your conversation.

I am, &c.

BALFOUR.

Enclosure 1 to No. 280

Note in reply to Cardinal Gasparri's Letter of May 15 addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations

CARDINAL GASPARRI'S letter of the 15th May appears to His Majesty's Government. They have the honour to communicate herewith, for the information of the Council of the League of Nations, copies of correspondence which has passed between His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Secretary of the Zionist Organisation, together with copies of a draft Order in Council which will shortly be made.

His Majesty's Government fully share the opinion expressed by Cardinal Gasparri that the Covenant of the League of Nations would be incompatible with the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine. They have the honour to communicate herewith, for the information of the Council of the League of Nations, copies of correspondence which has passed between His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Secretary of the Zionist Organisation, together with copies of a draft Order in Council which will shortly be made.

His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies has debated this statement enclosed with his letter of the 3rd June to the Secretary of the Zionist Organisation, and the organisation have accepted it in their reply of the 14th June. The Council will observe that His Majesty's Government contemplate that the status of the Jewish people in Palestine should be the same as that of the other nationalities in the country, and that it has never been intended that they or any section of them should possess any other juridical status.

As the Secretary of State for the Colonies has pointed out in the statement referred to above, the special position assigned to the Zionist Organisation in article 4 of the draft mandate for Palestine does not imply administrative functions. That special position relates to the measures to be taken in Palestine affecting the Jewish population, and contemplates that the organisation may assist in the general development of the country, but does not entitle it to share in any degree in its government. The draft Order in Council relating to the administration of Palestine does not even refer to the Zionist Organisation.

The Government of His Majesty the King are taking the action which His Majesty's Government are taking, as explained above. You should at the same time point out to him how unfounded are the apprehensions which have been expressed in certain quarters regarding the policy of His Majesty's Government.

The Government of His Majesty the King are taking the action which His Majesty's Government are taking, as explained above. You should at the same time point out to him how unfounded are the apprehensions which have been expressed in certain quarters regarding the policy of His Majesty's Government.

against the very injury which the Cardinal Secretary of State anticipates will result from it.

3. His Majesty's Government also alludes to article 11 of the draft mandate in support of its opinion that the Jews are to be given a privileged and preponderating position as against other nationalities and creeds. His Majesty's Government regards the provision by which the Administration may arrange with the Jewish agency mentioned in article 4 to construct or operate upon fair and equitable terms any public works

recognition of the special situation which arises in Palestine from the charge which has been laid upon them by the Principal Allied Powers, and also of the fact that the Jewish people, in virtue of that policy, are ready and willing to contribute by their resources and efforts to develop the country for the good of all its inhabitants.

4. His Majesty's Government invites the attention of the Council of the League of Nations to article 13 of the draft Palestine Order in Council, which provides that

the Council shall be passed by the Legislative Council, which shall be composed of representatives of the various religious communities and the free exercise of all religious and civil liberties, and the maintenance of public order and the well-being of the population.

5. His Majesty's Government is confident that the Council will agree that these provisions

in any way be repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the provisions of the mandate to be issued for Palestine.

7. Article 26 of the same draft order provides that the High Commissioner shall have the right to remove for the significance of the pleasure of His Majesty any civil or military officer by the Legislative Council which concerns matters dealt with specifically by the provisions of the mandate.

8. Article 26 of the same document provides for appeals to the Council of the League of Nations by any religious community or considerable section of the population of Palestine which complains that the terms of the mandate are not being carried out.

9. His Majesty's Government is confident that the Council will agree that these provisions will be sufficient to provide ample safeguards against the risk that any nationality or community will be subordinated in any way to any other.

10. As regards the second point raised by the Cardinal Secretary of State, namely the provision of adequate safeguards for the rights of the Christian denominations, His Majesty's Government offers the following observations. In so far as civil and political rights are concerned, it will be apparent to the Council from what has already been said that the apprehensions of the Cardinal Secretary of State are unfounded. With regard to religious rights, His Majesty's Government invites the attention of the Council to the provisions of articles 54 and 55 of the draft Palestine Order in Council, which provide for the jurisdiction of the High Commissioner in matters relating to the rights of each religious community in its own internal affairs.

11. His Majesty's Government is confident that the Council will agree that these provisions will be sufficient to provide ample safeguards against the risk that any nationality or community will be subordinated in any way to any other.

12. His Majesty's Government is confident that the Council will agree that these provisions will be sufficient to provide ample safeguards against the risk that any nationality or community will be subordinated in any way to any other.

13. His Majesty's Government is confident that the Council will agree that these provisions will be sufficient to provide ample safeguards against the risk that any nationality or community will be subordinated in any way to any other.

14. His Majesty's Government is confident that the Council will agree that these provisions will be sufficient to provide ample safeguards against the risk that any nationality or community will be subordinated in any way to any other.

15. His Majesty's Government is confident that the Council will agree that these provisions will be sufficient to provide ample safeguards against the risk that any nationality or community will be subordinated in any way to any other.

16. His Majesty's Government is confident that the Council will agree that these provisions will be sufficient to provide ample safeguards against the risk that any nationality or community will be subordinated in any way to any other.

17. His Majesty's Government is confident that the Council will agree that these provisions will be sufficient to provide ample safeguards against the risk that any nationality or community will be subordinated in any way to any other.

18. His Majesty's Government is confident that the Council will agree that these provisions will be sufficient to provide ample safeguards against the risk that any nationality or community will be subordinated in any way to any other.

Nations or by the President of the Court of International Justice, while reserving to themselves the right to submit additional names for stated reasons to the Council of the League for approval. The panel should, in their opinion, be composed of persons of high standing and thoroughly representative international body, on which none of the Great Powers

and Jew, would be without representation. His Majesty's Government would also invite the Council of the League to appoint one of the members of the commission as its first chairman by whatever procedure commands itself to the Council.

12. The Council will observe that His Majesty's Government do not propose in the draft article which is now enclosed to retain the obligation that the commission shall necessarily ensure that certain Holy Places, religious buildings or sites are entrusted to the permanent control of suitable bodies. Nor have they attempted to define the exact number of members of whom the commission shall be composed beyond providing that the body shall be sufficiently large to ensure all interests being represented upon it.

13. The reason which has prompted His Majesty's Government to suggest that prospective nominees shall be recommended under some international procedure rather than by political or hierarchical authorities is that it appears to them preferable that a body to which this responsible task is to be entrusted should not be composed of persons who might possibly be regarded as agents of a particular power or community whose interests might be directly concerned. Political interests are fully safeguarded by the provisions that the appointment of the commission shall be subject to the approval of the Council of the League of Nations and that all reports presented by the commission shall require their confirmation. Religious interests are equally well protected by the provisions that the commission shall be in consultation with representatives of the confessions concerned and that any religious confession which considers that the

of the League of Nations, who may require the mandatory to reassemble the

14. His Majesty's Government confidently expect that the Great Powers and confessions who are interested in Palestine, and who wish, it is hoped, also be represented upon the commission, will realize that the traditional policy of His Majesty's Government in regard to the Holy Places Commission are such as to dispel all legitimate apprehensions. They invite the Council to agree that no further political or religious safeguard is either necessary or practicable.

Enclosure 2 in No. 280.

Article 14

Notwithstanding the provisions of article 13, the mandatory is pledged under the preceding article to maintain a commission, consisting of not less than seven members, shall be appointed by the Council of the League of Nations. The duty of the commission shall be to frame a report defining these rights, including rights of ownership, user and access. The report shall be laid before the Council of the League of Nations for confirmation, and when confirmed shall be binding on the mandatory.

15. The commission shall be empowered to investigate all claims to any of the Holy Places and religious buildings or sites, and will endeavour, in consultation with representatives of the confessions concerned, to arrive at an agreed definition of the rights in question. If the commission is unable to arrive at an agreed definition, it shall, in each case, by the commission, the commission, after hearing all parties, shall decide judicially on the claims of which it has had notice, and shall embody such decisions in its report.

16. The commission shall be empowered to investigate all claims to any of the Holy Places and religious buildings or sites, and will endeavour, in consultation with representatives of the confessions concerned, to arrive at an agreed definition of the rights in question. If the commission is unable to arrive at an agreed definition, it shall, in each case, by the commission, the commission, after hearing all parties, shall decide judicially on the claims of which it has had notice, and shall embody such decisions in its report.

Such control will be guaranteed by the League of Nations.

3. The commission will settle its own procedure, and shall appoint its own staff. Each member of the commission will in turn act as chairman of the commission. The expenses of the commission shall be defrayed by the League of Nations.

4. In all cases dealt with under this article, the right and duty of the mandatory to maintain order and decorum in the place concerned shall not be affected, and the buildings and sites will be subject to the provisions of such laws relating to public monuments as may be enacted in Palestine with the approval of the mandatory.

5. Any religious confession which considers that the mandatory is not giving effect to the provisions of the report may appeal to the Council of the League, who may require the mandatory to reassemble the commission for the purpose of considering and reporting upon any such appeal. Such report shall be laid before the Council of the League of Nations for confirmation, and when confirmed shall be binding on the mandatory.

Enclosure 3 in No. 280.

Colonial Office to the Zionist Organisation

Sir,

Colonial Office, June 3, 1922

I AM directed by Mr. Secretary Churchill to enclose, to be laid before your organisation, copy of a statement which it is proposed to publish, dealing with the detail the means by which it is intended to carry into effect the establishment of a Jewish national home in the country. Under article 4 of the draft mandate submitted to the Council of the League of Nations, a special position is assigned to your

respect. In these circumstances it appears to Mr. Churchill that the declared aims and intentions of your organisation should be consistent with the policy of His Majesty's Government, but that this identity of aim should be made patent both to the people of Palestine and of this country, and indeed to the world at large. Mr. Churchill feels sure that you will appreciate this consideration and will be anxious to do all in your power to remove any misunderstanding that may have arisen. He would accordingly be glad to receive from you a formal assurance that your organisation's own activities in conformity therewith.

I am, Sir,

J. R. SHUCKBURGH

British Policy in Palestine

The Secretary of State for the Colonies has given renewed consideration to the existing political situation in Palestine, with a very earnest desire to arrive at a settlement of the claims of the various sections of the population. After consultation with the High Commissioner for Palestine the following statement has been drawn up. It summarises the essential points of the policy of His Majesty's Government, and a delegation from the Moslem-Christian Society of Palestine which has been for some time in England, and it states the further conclusions which have since been reached.

The tension which has prevailed from time to time in Palestine is mainly due to the conflicting claims of the various sections of the population. The policy of His Majesty's Government is to secure the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, made on behalf of His Majesty's Government on the 2nd November, 1917. Unauthorised statements have been made to the effect that the purpose in view is to create a wholly Jewish Palestine. Phrases have been used such as that Palestine is to become "an English gland in England." His Majesty's Government regard any such expectation as impracticable and have no such aim in view. Nor have they at any time contemplated, as appears to be feared by the Arab delegation, the disappearance or the subordination of the Arabic population, language or culture in Palestine. They would draw attention to the fact that the terms of the declaration referred to do not contemplate that

Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish national home, but that such a home should be founded in Palestine. In this connection it has been observed with satisfaction that at the meeting of the Zionist Congress, the supreme governing body of the Zionist Organisation, held at Carlsbad in September 1921, a resolution was passed expressing as the official statement of Zionist

people to live with the Arab people on terms of equality and to make the common home into a flourishing one, which may assure to each of its peoples an equal share in the development

It is also necessary to point out that the Zionist Commission in Palestine, now termed the Palestine Zionist Executive, has not desired to possess, and does not possess, any share in the general administration of the country. Nor does the special position assigned to the Zionist Organisation in article 4 of the draft mandate for Palestine involve any such functions. That special position relates to the measures to be taken in Palestine affecting the Jewish population, and contemplates that the organisation may share in the general development of the country, but does not entitle it to share in any degree in its government.

Further, it is contemplated that the status of all citizens of Palestine in the eyes of the law shall be Palestinian, and it has never been intended that they or any section of them shall possess any other juridical status. So far as the Jewish population of Palestine are concerned, it appears that some among them are apprehensive that the declaration of 1917. It is necessary, therefore, once more to affirm that those fears are unfounded, and that that declaration, reaffirmed by the conference of the Principal Allied Powers at San Remo and again in the Treaty of Sévres, is not susceptible of change.

During the last two or three generations the Jews have recreated in Palestine a community numbering 80,000, of whom about one-fourth are farmers or workers. It has its own political organs and elected councils, its own domestic concerns, elected councils in the towns and an organisation of its schools. It has its elected chief rabbinate and rabbinical council for its religious affairs. Its business is conducted in its own vernacular language, and a Hebrew press serves its needs. It has its distinctive intellectual life and displays considerable economic activity. This community, with its town and country population, its political, religious and social organisation, its own language, its own customs, its own life, has, in fact, "national" characteristics. When it is asked what is meant by the declaration of 1917, the answer is that it is the reason why it is necessary that Palestine should be internationally guaranteed, and that it should be formally recognised to rest upon ancient historic

the interpretation which His Majesty's Government place upon the declaration of 1917, and, as understood, the Secretary of State is of opinion that it does not contain or imply anything which need cause either alarm to the Arab population of Palestine or disappointment to the Jews.

For the fulfilment of this policy it is necessary that the Jewish community in Palestine should be able to increase its numbers by immigration. This immigration cannot be so great in volume as to exceed whatever may be the economic capacity of the country at the time to absorb new arrivals. It is essential to ensure that the immigrants should not be a burden upon the people of Palestine as a whole, and that they should not deprive any section of the present population of their employment. Hitherto the immigration has fulfilled these conditions. The number of immigrants since the British occupation has been about 25,000.

It is intended that a special committee should be established in Palestine, consisting entirely of members of the new Legislative Council elected by the people, to confer

with the Administration upon matters relating to the regulation of immigration. Should any difference of opinion arise between this committee and the Administration, the matter will be referred to His Majesty's Government, who will give it special consideration. In addition, under article 81 of the draft Palestine Order in Council any religious community or considerable section of the population of Palestine will have a general right to appeal, through the High Commissioner and the Secretary of State, to the League of Nations on any matter on which they may consider that the Government of Palestine are not being fulfilled by the Government of Palestine.

With reference to the Constitution which it is now intended to establish in Palestine, the Government of Palestine have given an undertaking that an independent body will be established in Palestine.

MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT have given an undertaking that an independent body will be established in Palestine.

territories, the portions of Syria lying to the west of the district of Haifa, the reservation has always been regarded by His Majesty's Government as being the domain of the Jewish people.

Nevertheless, it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to foster the establishment of a full measure of self-government in Palestine. But this should be done by gradual stages and not suddenly. The first step was taken when, on the 22nd of April 1920, a civil Administration, the nominated Advisory Council which now exists, was established. It was stated at the time by the High Commissioner that this was the first step in the development of self-governing institutions, and it is now proposed to take a second step by the establishment of a Legislative Council, containing a large number of members elected on a wide franchise. It was proposed in the published programme of the members of this council should be non-official persons. By the High Commissioner, but representations having been made in opposition to this proposal, based on cogent considerations, the Secretary of State is prepared to omit it. The Legislative Council would then consist of the High Commissioner as president, and twelve elected and ten official members. The Secretary of State is of opinion that before a further measure of self-government is extended to Palestine and the Assembly placed in control over the executive it would be wise to allow some time to elapse. During this period the institutions of the country will have become well established, its financial credit will be based on firm foundations, and the Palestinian officials will have been enabled to gain experience of sound methods of government. After a few years the situation will be again reviewed, and if the experience of the working of the Constitution now to be established is warranted, a larger share of authority would then be extended to the elected representatives of the people.

The Secretary of State would point out that already the present Administration has transferred to a Supreme Council, elected by the Moslem community of Palestine, the entire control of Moslem religious endowments (Wakfs) and of the Moslem religious courts. To this council the Administration has also voluntarily restored considerable revenues derived from ancient endowments which had been sequestered by the Turkish Government. The Education Department is also advised by a committee representative of all sections of the population, and the Department of Commerce and Industry has the benefit of the co-operation of the Chambers of Commerce which have been established in the principal centres. It is the intention of the Administration to associate in an increased degree similar representative committees with the various Departments of the Government.

The Secretary of State believes that a policy upon these lines, coupled with the recognition of the rights of each community with reference to its Holy Places, cannot but commend itself to the various sections of the population, and that upon this basis may be built up that spirit of co-operation upon which the future progress and prosperity of the Holy Land must largely depend.

Enclosure 4 in No. 280.

The Zionist Organisation to Colonial Office

Sir,

77, Great Russell Street, London, June 18, 1922

WITH reference to your letter of the 3rd June, receipt of which has already been acknowledged, I have the honour to inform you that the executive of the Zionist Organisation have considered the statement relative to the policy of His Majesty's Government in Palestine, of which you have been good enough to furnish them with a copy, and have passed the following resolution:—

"The executive of the Zionist Organisation, having taken note of the statement relative to British policy in Palestine transmitted to them by the Colonial Office, under date the 3rd June, 1922, assure His Majesty's Government that the activities of the Zionist Organisation will be conducted in conformity with the policy therein set forth.

The executive observe with satisfaction that His Majesty's Government, in defining their policy in Palestine, take occasion once more to reaffirm the declaration of the Balfour Declaration, and that the Jewish people should know that it is in Palestine as of right.

The executive further observe that His Majesty's Government also acknowledge, as a corollary of this right, that it is necessary that the Jews shall be able to increase their numbers in Palestine by immigration and understand from the statement of policy that the volume of such immigration is to be determined by the economic capacity of the country from time to time to absorb new arrivals. Whatever arrangements may be made in regard to the regulation of such immigration, the executive confidently trust that both His Majesty's Government and the Administration of Palestine will be guided in this matter by the aforesaid principle.

The Zionist Organisation has at all times been sincerely desirous of proceeding in co-operation with all sections of the people of Palestine. It has repeatedly expressed its desire, and deed, that nothing is farther from its purpose than to interfere with the civil or religious rights or the material interests of the non-Jewish population. The Zionist Organisation will continue on its side to make no efforts to foster the spirit of goodwill in which His Majesty's Government are pointed as the only sure foundation for the future prosperity of Palestine. The Zionist Organisation's policy, which His Majesty's Government propose to issue will once and for all dispel such misapprehensions as may still exist, and that, loyally accepted by all parties concerned, it may mark the opening of a new era of peaceful progress.

I have, &c
CH. WEIZMANN

E 6068 78 651

No. 261

The Earl of Balfour to Count de Saint-Aulaire.

Your Excellency,

Foreign Office, June 10, 1922.

WITH reference to your note of the 9th ultimo, I have the honour to inform your Excellency that His Majesty's Government have not received from the Vatican a specific statement that the appointment of the chairman of the Holy Places Commission should be postponed. They have, however, received a statement that the Holy Places Commission will be appointed in the near future.

His Majesty's Government have carefully considered these objections and, in order to remove all possible ground for apprehension, they intend to propose at the forthcoming meeting of the Council of the League of Nations that a new article, a draft of which I have the honour to enclose, should be substituted for article 14 of the Palestine mandate. His Majesty's Government confidently expect that your Government will welcome the fresh proposals of His Majesty's Government as likely to show more clearly the precise intentions of articles 13 and 14 of the Palestine mandate, and to dispel the unfounded apprehensions which have been expressed in certain quarters on this subject.

1. I shall be glad if you will communicate a copy of this article at as early a date as possible to your Government, with the intimation that His Majesty's Government are suggesting to the Council of the League that nominees for the commission should be selected from a panel put forward under some international procedure, and composed of a thoroughly representative international body on which none of the Great Powers interested in Palestine and none of the confessions, namely, Christian, Mahomedan and Jew, shall be without representation.

2. His Majesty's Government regard France as one of the Great Powers interested in Palestine which should not be without representation upon the commission.

3. They would also invite the Council of the League of Nations to appoint one of the members of the commission as its first chairman by whatever procedure recommends itself to the Council.

I have, &c
BALFOUR

Enclosure in No. 251

Draft Article 14 of the Palestine Mandate.

1. In order to determine the existing rights in the Holy Places and religious buildings or sites in Palestine, which the mandatory is pledged under the preceding article to protect, a commission, not less than seven members shall be appointed by the Council of the League of Nations. The report shall be laid before the Council of the League of Nations for confirmation, and when confirmed shall be binding on the mandatory.

In the preparation of their report the commission will consider all conflicting claims to any of the Holy Places and religious buildings or sites, and will endeavour, in consultation with representatives of the confessions concerned, to arrive at an agreed definition of existing rights. If no agreement can be arrived at within a period to be fixed in each case by the commission, the commission, after hearing all parties, shall decide judicially on the claims of which it has had notice and shall embody such decisions in their report.

The report of the commission may also contain recommendations for ensuring that certain Holy Places, religious buildings or sites which the commission finds to be regarded with special veneration by the adherents of one particular religion, are entrusted to the permanent control of suitable bodies representing the adherents of the religion concerned.

Such control will be guaranteed by the League of Nations.

2. The commission will settle its own procedure and shall appoint its own staff. Each member of the commission will in turn act as chairman of the commission. The expenses of the commission shall be defrayed by the League of Nations.

3. In all cases dealt with under this article the right and duty of the mandatory to protect and sites will be subject to the provisions of such laws relating to public monuments as may be enacted in Palestine with the approval of the mandatory.

4. Any religious confession which considers that the mandatory is not giving effect to the provisions of the report may appeal to the Council of the League, who may require the mandatory to reassemble the commission for the purpose of considering and reporting upon any such appeal. Such report shall be laid before the Council of the League of Nations for confirmation, and when confirmed shall be binding on the mandatory.

E 6068 78 65

No. 252

*The Earl of Balfour to Baron Hayashi.**

Your Excellency

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th inst. in relation to the subject mentioned.

* Also to the Italian, Brazilian and Belgian Ambassadors and the Spanish and Chinese Chargés d'Affaires, and the Japanese Consul-General.

the draft mandate for Palestine for dealing with the Holy Places and, in particular, to article 14 of that draft.

2. In order to remove all possible ground for apprehension His Majesty's Government intend to propose, at the forthcoming meeting of the Council of the League of Nations, a draft of which I have the honour to enclose* should be substituted for article 14 of the Palestine mandate. The intention of this article is to make it quite clear that His Majesty's Government are desirous that the existing rights in the Holy Places, religious buildings or sites in Palestine should be investigated and determined in the first place by a thoroughly representative international commission of whose impartiality there can be no question, whose appointment shall be subject to the approval of the League of Nations, and that any subsequent disputes to which the application of these decisions may give rise should be summarily dealt with, His Majesty's Government confidently expect that your Government will welcome the fresh proposals of His Majesty's Government as likely to show more clearly the precise intention of articles 13 and 14 of the Palestine mandate and to dispel the unfounded apprehensions which have been expressed in certain quarters on this subject.

3. I shall be glad if your Excellency will communicate a copy of this article at as early a date as possible to your Government, with the intimation that His Majesty's Government are suggesting to the Council of the League that nominees for the commission should be selected from a panel put forward under some international procedure, and composed of persons of world-wide reputation, to be chosen in such a way that the commission shall be a thoroughly representative international body on which none of the Great Powers interested in Palestine and none of the three confessions, namely, Christian, Mahomedan and Jew, shall be without representation upon the commission. They would also invite the Council of the League of Nations to appoint one of the members of the commission as its first chairman by whatever procedure recommends itself to the Council.

I have, &c
BALFOUR

E 6516 78 65

No. 251

Foreign Office to Cabinet Offices.

Sir,

Foreign Office, June 30, 1922.

I AM PLEASSED to inform you that I have forwarded to the Secretariat of the League of Nations, copies of the revised final draft of the mandate for Palestine.

It will be observed that, in addition to the revision of article 14, regarding which the Colonial Office are understood to have addressed you a communication, certain modifications have been made in the final draft of the mandate as published in August last.

Article 8 now reads—

The immunities and privileges of foreigners, including the benefits of consular jurisdiction and protection as formerly enjoyed by capitulation or usage in the Ottoman Empire, are suspended in Palestine, but shall be revived on the termination of the mandate regime, unless the High Commissioner, on the 1st August 1922, or on any date thereafter, shall have agreed, or have agreed, by treaty to their suspension.

In article 25 the words "with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations" have been inserted between the words "shall be entitled" and "to postpone."

Article 27 the words after "mandate" have now been omitted.

3. The following verbal alterations have also been made:—

Preamble. In first sentence: "Renounces" vice "declares."

Article 1: "This mandate" vice "the present mandate."

Article 4: "Affect" vice "effect."

Article 12. In second sentence: "He" vice "it."

* See enclosure in No. 251.

† To Italian Ambassador only.

‡ U.K. No. 1200.

Article 21: Concluding words now read "to the nationals of all members of the League of Nations."

Article 27: "This mandate" vice "the present mandate."

Article 28: Concluding words now read "members of the League" vice "Power signatories of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey"

I am to request that the above emendations may be pointed out to the Secretariat of the League of Nations, and that the Council may be urged, in the light of these emendations, formally to approve the terms of the mandate at their forthcoming session.

I am, &c
LANCÉLOT OLIPHANT

Enclosure in No. 283.

Revised Final Draft of the Mandate for Palestine for the Approval of the Council of the League of Nations.

THE Council of the League of Nations

Whereas by article 132 of the Treaty of Peace signed at Sévres on the 10th day of August, 1920, Turkey renounces in favour of the Principal Allied Powers all rights and title over Palestine; and

Whereas by article 23 of the said treaty the high contracting parties agreed to entrust, by application of the provisions of article 22, the administration of Palestine, as a separate entity, to a Mandatory to be selected by the said Powers; and

Whereas by the same article the high contracting parties further agreed that the mandatory should be responsible for putting into effect the declaration originally made on the 2nd November, 1917, by the Government of His Britannic Majesty, and adopted by the other Allied Powers, in favour of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which might prejudice the rights of the Arab population in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country; and

Whereas recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine, and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country; and

Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have selected His Britannic Majesty as the mandatory for Palestine; and

Whereas the terms of the mandate in respect of Palestine have been formulated in the following terms, and submitted to the Council of the League for approval; and

Whereas His Britannic Majesty has accepted the mandate in respect of Palestine, and undertaken to exercise it on behalf of the League of Nations in conformity with the following provisions.—

Hereby approves the terms of the said mandate as follows —

ARTICLE 1.

The Britannic Majesty shall have the right to exercise as mandatory all the powers which would otherwise be exercised by the State, save as they may be limited by the terms of this mandate.

ARTICLE 2.

The mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home, and shall facilitate the immigration of Jewish settlers into the country, and the development of self governing institutions, consistent with the prevailing conditions.

ARTICLE 3.

The mandatory shall encourage the widest measure of self-government for localities consistent with the prevailing conditions.

ARTICLE 4.

A Jewish Agency shall be recognised as a public body for the purpose of co-ordinating Jewish efforts in Palestine, and shall be responsible for the social and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine, and, subject always to the control of the Administration, to assist and take part in the development of the country.

The Zionist organisation, so long as its organisation and constitution are in the interests of the Jewish people, shall be recognised as the body to be consulted in the steps in consultation with His Britannic Majesty's Government to secure the co-operation of all Jews who are willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish national home.

ARTICLE 5.

The mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that no Palestine territory shall be ceded or leased to, or in any way placed under the control of, the Government of any foreign Power.

ARTICLE 6.

The Administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced, shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions, and shall encourage, in co-operation with the Jewish Agency referred to in article 4, close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes.

ARTICLE 7.

The Administration of Palestine will be responsible for enacting a nationality law. There shall be included in this law provisions framed so as to facilitate the acquisition of Palestinian citizenship by Jews who take up their permanent residence in Palestine.

ARTICLE 8.

The immunities and privileges of foreigners, including the benefits of consular jurisdiction and protection as formerly enjoyed by Capitulation or usage in the Ottoman Empire, are suspended in Palestine, but shall be revived immediately and completely upon the termination of the mandate, unless the High Contracting Parties have agreed, by treaty, on the 1st August, 1914, to such rights should agree, or have agreed, by treaty to their suspension or modification.

ARTICLE 9.

The mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that the judicial system established in Palestine shall be based on the principles of justice and equity, and shall, to the extent deemed expedient, the jurisdiction now existing in Palestine with regard to questions arising out of the religious beliefs of certain communities (such as the laws of Wakf and personal status). In particular the mandatory agrees that the control and administration of Wakfs shall be exercised in accordance with religious law and the dispositions of the founders.

ARTICLE 10.

The extradition treaties in force between the mandatory and other foreign Powers shall apply to Palestine.

ARTICLE 11.

The Administration of Palestine shall take all necessary measures to safeguard the interests of the Jewish population, and shall, subject to article 311 of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey, shall have full power to provide for public ownership or control of any of the natural resources of the country or of the public works, services and utilities established or to be established therein. It shall also take such steps as may be appropriate to the needs of the country, having regard, among other things, to the desirability of promoting the close settlement and intensive cultivation of the land.

The Administration may arrange with the Jewish agency mentioned in article 4 to construct or operate, upon fair and equitable terms, any public works, services and utilities, and to develop any of the natural resources of the country, in so far as these are not directly undertaken by the Administration. Any such arrangements shall provide that no profits distributed by such agency, directly or indirectly, shall exceed a reasonable rate of interest on the capital and any further profits shall be utilized by it for the benefit of the country in a manner approved by the Administration.

ARTICLE 12.

The mandatory shall be entrusted with the control of the foreign relations of Palestine and the right to issue exequaturs to consuls appointed by foreign Powers. He shall also be entitled to afford diplomatic and consular protection to citizens of Palestine when outside its territorial limits.

ARTICLE 13.

All responsibility in connection with the Holy Places and religious buildings or sites in Palestine, including that of preserving existing rights, of securing free access to the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites and the free exercise of worship, while

the Administration is in all matters connected therewith in accordance with the provisions of this article into effect; and provided also that the Administration shall be construed as conferring upon the mandatory authority in the management of purely Moslem sacred shrines, the rights of which are guaranteed.

ARTICLE 14.

In order to determine the existing rights in the Holy Places and religious buildings or sites in Palestine, which the mandatory is pledged under the preceding article to maintain, a commission consisting of not less than seven members shall be appointed by the mandatory subject to the approval of the Council of the League of Nations. The duty of the commission shall be to frame a report defining these rights, including rights of ownership, user and access. The report shall be laid before the Council of the League of Nations for confirmation, and when confirmed shall be binding on the mandatory.

In the preparation of their report the commission will consider all conflicting claims to any of the Holy Places and religious buildings or sites, and will endeavour in consultation with representatives of the confessions concerned to arrive at a definition of existing rights. If no agreement can be arrived at within the time fixed in each case by the commission, the commission after hearing the parties shall decide judicially on the claims of which it is required to report.

The report of the commission may also contain recommendations for ensuring that certain Holy Places, religious buildings or sites which the commission finds to be regarded with special veneration by the adherents of one particular religion are entrusted to the permanent control of suitable bodies representing the adherents of the religion concerned.

Such control will be guaranteed by the League of Nations.

The commission will settle its own procedure, and shall appoint its own staff. Each member of the commission will in turn act as chairman of the commission. The expenses of the commission shall be defrayed by the League of Nations.

In all cases dealt with under this article, the right and duty of the mandatory to maintain order and decorum in the place concerned shall not be affected, and the buildings and sites will be subject to the provisions of such laws relating to public monuments as may be enacted in Palestine with the approval of the mandatory.

Any religious confession which considers that the mandatory is not giving effect to the provisions of the report may appeal to the Council of the League, who may require the mandatory to reassemble the commission for the purpose of considering and reporting upon any such appeal. Such report shall be laid before the Council of the League of Nations for confirmation, and when confirmed shall be binding on the mandatory.

ARTICLE 15.

The mandatory will see that complete freedom of conscience and the free exercise of all forms of worship, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, is ensured to all. No discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Palestine on the ground of race, religion or language. No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of his religious belief.

The right of each community to maintain its own schools for the education of its own members in its own language (while conforming to such educational requirements of a general nature as the Administration may impose) shall not be denied or impaired.

ARTICLE 16.

The mandatory shall be responsible for exercising such supervision over religious or eleemosynary bodies of all faiths in Palestine as may be required for the maintenance of public order and good government. Subject to such supervision no measures shall be taken in Palestine to obstruct or interfere with the enterprise of such bodies or to discriminate on the ground of race, religion or nationality.

ARTICLE 17.

The Administration of Palestine may organize on a voluntary basis the forces necessary for the preservation of peace and order, and also for the defence of the country subject, however, to the supervision of the mandatory, but shall not use them for purposes other than those above specified save with the consent of the mandatory. The Administration of Palestine shall be responsible for the maintenance of the forces organized by the Administration of Palestine.

Nothing in this article shall preclude the Administration of Palestine from contributing to the cost of the maintenance of forces maintained by the mandatory.

The mandatory shall be entitled at all time to use the roads, railways and ports of Palestine for the movement of armed forces and the carriage of fuel and supplies.

ARTICLE 18.

The mandatory must see that there is no discrimination in Palestine against the inhabitants of any race, religion or language. No discrimination shall be made in the treatment of the inhabitants of Palestine as compared with those of the mandatory or of any foreign State in matters concerning taxation, commerce or navigation, the exercise of industries or professions, or in the treatment of merchant vessels or civil aircraft. Similarly there shall be no discrimination in Palestine against goods originating in any of the mandated States, and there shall be freedom of transit under the conditions across the mandated area.

Subject as aforesaid the mandatory shall see that the Administration of Palestine shall be responsible for the maintenance of the forces organized by the Administration of Palestine.

Nothing in this article shall prevent the Government of Palestine, on the advice of the mandatory, from taking such measures as may be necessary for the maintenance of public order and good government.

ARTICLE 19.

The mandatory will adhere on behalf of the Administration to any general international conventions already existing or that may be concluded hereafter with the object of securing the free movement of persons, goods, and capital, and of ensuring the freedom of transit, or the traffic in drugs, or relating to commercial equality, freedom of transit and navigation, aerial navigation, and postal, telegraphic and wireless communication, or literary, artistic or industrial property.

ARTICLE 20.

The mandatory will co-operate on behalf of the Administration of Palestine, so far as its resources, social and other conditions may permit, in the execution of any common policy adopted by the League of Nations for preventing and combating disease, including diseases of plants and animals.

ARTICLE 21

The mandatory will secure, within twelve months from the date of the coming into force of this mandate, the enactment, and will ensure the execution of a law of antiquities based on the provisions of article 421 of Part XIII of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey. This law shall replace the former Ottoman law of antiquities, and shall ensure equality of treatment in the matter of archaeological research to the nationals of all members of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 22.

English, Arabic and Hebrew shall be the official languages of Palestine. Any statement or inscriptions in Arabic on stamps or money in Palestine shall be repeated in Hebrew, and any statements or inscriptions in Hebrew shall be repeated in Arabic.

ARTICLE 23.

The Administration of Palestine shall recognize the holy days of the respective communities in Palestine as legal days of rest for the members of such communities.

ARTICLE 24

The mandatory shall make to the Council of the League of Nations a report as to the measures taken during the year to carry out the provisions of this mandate. Copies of all laws and regulations promulgated or issued during the year shall be communicated with the report.

ARTICLE 25

The mandatory shall make to the Council of the League of Nations a report as to the measures taken during the year to carry out the provisions of this mandate. Copies of all laws and regulations promulgated or issued during the year shall be communicated with the report.

ARTICLE 26.

The mandatory shall make to the Council of the League of Nations a report as to the measures taken during the year to carry out the provisions of this mandate. Copies of all laws and regulations promulgated or issued during the year shall be communicated with the report.

ARTICLE 27.

The consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for any modification of the terms of this mandate.

ARTICLE 28

In the event of the termination of the mandate conferred upon the mandatory by this declaration, the Council of the League of Nations shall make such arrangements as may be necessary for the protection of the rights secured by articles 13 and 14, and for securing, under the guarantee of the League, that the Government of Palestine will fully honour the financial obligations, legitimately incurred by the Administration of Palestine during the period of the mandate.

The present copy shall be signed by the Secretary General of the League of Nations, and certified copies shall be forwarded by the Secretary General of the League of Nations to all members of the League.

Made at the day of

CHAPTER IV.—GENERAL.

F 1248 B 441

No. 284

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Lord Hardinge (Paris)

(No. 344.)

My Lord,

Foreign Office, February 2, 1922

THE French Ambassador came to see me this afternoon and in the course of our conversation handed me a document of many pages containing, in a formal shape and drawn up as he believed by M. Poincaré himself, the observations of the French Government concerning the modifications which they desire to introduce into the text of the proposed treaty of guarantee between France and Great Britain. The substance of this memorandum he had communicated to me before in our various conversations, but only as he said in a personal capacity. He now desired to hand it in collectively and formally on behalf of his Government.

His Excellency then passed on to renew, in an apologetic vein, his observations on the recent unfortunate letter of his Government concerning the Greco-Turkish situation, which letter I now knew, and he also was aware that I knew, even though the substance of it might have been sent to him from Paris, had been composed by himself. While he repeated to me with much reiteration what he had intended to convey, I had no alternative but to reply that he had signally failed to convey it, and that the impression which his letter had produced upon me had been shared by everyone who had read the document.

I told him, however, that I was much more concerned with what we were going to do at the conference at Paris than with what had previously been written. I was aware from a telegram from your Lordship what had passed in the interview between yourself and M. Poincaré and, indeed, the Count de Saint-Aulaire proceeded to give me the same information on his own account. I was glad I said to learn that M. Poincaré had modified his attitude on many of the important particulars upon which I had commented, but there remained two important points upon which

If, as I gathered, M. Poincaré or the Turks were going to press for the complete evacuation of Anatolia by the Greeks, what, I asked, were the guarantees the French were going to propose for the safety and indeed the lives of the large Greek population in Smyrna, Ayvalik, and other towns in the interior. It was out of the question to trust them to the tender mercy of the Turks. We had ample and reliable evidence that the Angora Turks had been deporting the Christian populations of Eastern Anatolia in large masses to the coast amid every circumstance of cruelty and suffering. Their policy was indeed admitted by them to be one of deliberate extermination. Was it the least likely that Europe would stand by to see the Greeks on the Smyrna coast or in the interior treated in a similar fashion? Was it not absurd to rely upon the paper guarantees for minorities in the European treaties?

His Excellency admitted that something much more substantial would be wanted in the present case, though he did not indicate to me clearly where it was to be found. He thought, however, that complete and immediate evacuation would be found impossible and that it could only be effected by stages. Meanwhile he placed great reliance upon the creation of a gendarmerie under Allied officers.

I said I did not believe for one moment that any such body would be able to prevent massacre if the Turks were bent upon it, and I earnestly urged the French Government if their proposals were going to be of the character indicated by M. Poincaré to address themselves to the case not merely of the Greeks whom they wished to turn out, but of the Greeks who were going to be left behind.

The second point upon which I said I had so far had no reply from M. Poincaré was the view of the French Government as to the steps to be taken if an agreement arrived at between the Powers was absolutely rejected by the Turks.

The Ambassador asked me what I would do in those circumstances, to which I replied that the question was one which I had originally contemplated examining in concert with the French at Paris, but it was they who had forced the matter to the front and compelled an earlier examination by laying down that in no circumstances whatsoever would they apply coercion to the Turks.

His Excellency reiterated that for the French Government to fight the Turks

or move forces against them was out of the question, and I readily allowed that we were as little anxious as the British Government to see the situation in the matter before the discussions in Paris began. One such form of pressure I did indeed indicate in my conversation, and that with a particular object. This might be a withdrawal of the British fleet from the Mediterranean. This might be a meeting in Paris to purchase arms, munitions and stores, not, indeed, from the Governments, but from any private firms who chose to supply them.

I then mentioned that I had been told that the French Government was considering the possibility of sending a mission to the Mediterranean to purchase arms, munitions and stores, not, indeed, from the Governments, but from any private firms who chose to supply them. I then mentioned that I had been told that the French Government was considering the possibility of sending a mission to the Mediterranean to purchase arms, munitions and stores, not, indeed, from the Governments, but from any private firms who chose to supply them.

Count de Saint-Aulaire pressed me to name a day when the suspended negotiations in Paris would resume. I told him that I did not think it probable that the return of Lord Allenby next week and the necessity of discussing the Egyptian situation with him would necessarily occupy me for the best part of the week after the 15th.

I then mentioned that I had been told that the French Government was considering the possibility of sending a mission to the Mediterranean to purchase arms, munitions and stores, not, indeed, from the Governments, but from any private firms who chose to supply them.

I then mentioned that I had been told that the French Government was considering the possibility of sending a mission to the Mediterranean to purchase arms, munitions and stores, not, indeed, from the Governments, but from any private firms who chose to supply them.

I then mentioned that I had been told that the French Government was considering the possibility of sending a mission to the Mediterranean to purchase arms, munitions and stores, not, indeed, from the Governments, but from any private firms who chose to supply them.

I then mentioned that I had been told that the French Government was considering the possibility of sending a mission to the Mediterranean to purchase arms, munitions and stores, not, indeed, from the Governments, but from any private firms who chose to supply them.

When I said that I supposed that the Ambassador, from his long Moroccan

experience, would be invited to represent his country, he said he thought this

C 2000 458 62

N 20

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston to Lord Hardings (Paris).

N 401
M 10

Foreign Office, February 5, 1922

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3rd inst. and in reply to inform you that the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston has been invited to represent his country at the Genoa Conference. I have the honor to inform you that the Marquess Curzon of Kedleston has been invited to represent his country at the Genoa Conference.

He presented to the Foreign Office on the 6th February a letter in which he stated that owing to the pressure of work arising out of the Cabinet yet found time to arrive at a final decision. I was however quite prepared to make certain preliminary observations to him about each.

Concerning the Genoa Conference I asked at once whether I was right in believing that the French Government intended to be represented.

The Count de Saint-Aulaire answered that the French Government held themselves absolutely bound by the decisions arrived at at Cannes with the consent of the late French Premier although he did not conceal from me that M. Briand's successor held somewhat different views. He also stated that the French Government had decided to send a mission to the Mediterranean to purchase arms, munitions and stores, not, indeed, from the Governments, but from any private firms who chose to supply them.

I then mentioned that I had been told that the French Government was considering the possibility of sending a mission to the Mediterranean to purchase arms, munitions and stores, not, indeed, from the Governments, but from any private firms who chose to supply them.

I then mentioned that I had been told that the French Government was considering the possibility of sending a mission to the Mediterranean to purchase arms, munitions and stores, not, indeed, from the Governments, but from any private firms who chose to supply them.

a delay in forming a Government might, if much

It is in Ministry, whenever constituted. If they thought that postponement for two or three weeks—to the end of March, for instance—was necessary, we should be quite prepared, as no doubt would be the French, to consider their views. But I did not think that the British Cabinet would favour a proposal for any longer or indefinite extension of time.

As regards the main question which I put, the Count de Saint-Aulaire said that my first interpretation of the note was unquestionably the right one, and that the French Government had no desire, by inventing obstacles, to retard indefinitely, much less to defeat, the conference to which all had agreed.

In that case I replied, it seemed to me that the sooner the points about which the French Government had doubts, or were in apprehension, could be removed, the better, and I felt sure that if the French Government were disposed to send over their experts to London to examine the matter with our own, we should be delighted to receive them. A committee had, I said, been sitting here to report upon the work in the economic sphere that would be before the conference, and its members would, I felt sure, be prepared to join without delay in conversations with colleagues from France, if the latter were disposed to come over.

When the Ambassador asked me how soon such discussions might take place, I replied that I had no doubt that as soon as the French Government was ready to attend, I further informed the Ambassador that the Prime Minister had just delivered an answer in the House of Commons to a question put by Commander K. The Prime Minister had just informed me that he had stated in his reply that he regarded the acceptance of the invitation by the Soviet Government as an acceptance of the conditions which had been laid down at Cannes for their attendance, and I suggested to his Excellency that he should read the terms of the answer in the newspapers to-morrow morning.

Passing to the question of the Near East, the Ambassador asked me if I was satisfied with the note which I had received from M. Poincaré himself in reply to the despatch which I had written to Paris.

I replied that I was, and that it rendered me more hopeful of the impending conference than I had previously felt inclined to be.

The Ambassador added that the necessity of finding a formula which would be acceptable to both sides was a very difficult one, and that it was possible for putting a provision in the treaty which would not be called in question. I replied that I was not sure that it was possible to find a formula which would be acceptable to both sides, and that I was not sure that it was possible to put a provision in the treaty which would not be called in question.

We then discussed the question of the proposed Anglo-French Treaty, and I said that I had not yet had time to go into this in detail with the Cabinet, as I hoped in a day or two to do, I was in a position, after the last two days' debate in both Houses of Parliament, to state even more clearly and frankly to the French Ambassador what the attitude not merely of the British Government but of public opinion in England, upon the question was likely to be. If his Excellency had looked at the papers he would have seen that while no speaker had expressed

any doubt as to the necessity for continuing the friendship and close understanding between the two nations, there were definite and not negligible sections of opinion who had not merely objected to any extension of the draft proposal of 1918, but had actually protested

more strongly than Lord Robert Cecil. The Ambassador would, therefore, be able to appreciate the different currents of thought in this country, and would realise the impossibility for the Government to go beyond that in which they would be supported by public opinion. I said that I did not think the Cabinet would be moved to go in substance at all outside the

boundaries of the Treaty of 1918. Nothing would be more unfortunate than to put a treaty before the House of Commons against which there voted a considerable minority. It would destroy not only the graciousness of the gift, but would permanently weaken its value. I should like, if the Pact were concluded, to hand it to France by the unanimous vote of both Houses of Parliament, but, if this were found to be impossible at any rate let the minority be small and inconspicuous.

The Ambassador expressed a very strong hope that we might be able to meet the French case over articles 42 and 43 of the Treaty of Versailles.

I said, in reply, that while I could not dispute the right of the French Government to insist upon the fulfilment of those two articles which might be tantamount to acts of aggression against France, I could not hold out the slightest hope that we should be able to accept the French proposal. It would be regarded by British opinion as embarking upon a policy of military adventure and potential danger.

His Excellency felt confident that even in this respect we should be able to find a formula, a refuge to which he has an extraordinary fondness for retreating when in difficulty.

I expressed the gravest doubt as to whether any formula could be found to cover the situation, and told him that I thought he must contemplate refusal on that point.

In leaving, his Excellency told me, "à titre personnel" (a qualification which he habitually employs when he is at all afraid of getting a rap over the knuckles at Paris) that he did not attach any value to the suggested consultations between the two General Staffs. As a matter of fact, they would in the ordinary course of business—granted that the agreement existed between us—confer from time to time, and he did not see the necessity of putting any provision to this effect into the treaty. On the other hand he urgently requested me not to repeat these personal views at Paris.

I am &c

CURZON OF KEDDIESTON

E 2406 31 91

No. 256

Memorandum respecting British Political Relations with Kuwait

IN view of the question that has arisen as to the position of foreigners in Kuwait, it may be of interest to give a brief account of the relations of His Majesty's Government with that territory.

1. About from about the middle of last century friendly intercourse had been maintained between the British and the Kuwaiti Governments, and in 1861 a treaty of friendship was concluded between them.

2. In 1899 the British Government, in view of the fact that the Kuwaiti Government was all the force at his command, in maintaining law and order in his part of the Gulf. At that time no definite arrangement was made, though at the end of the year (1897) a threatened attack on Kuwait by the sheikhs of El Katr was prevented by the despatch of a British gunboat, and Sheikh Mubarak renewed his request for British protection.

3. Various forward moves were made by the Turkish authorities, and, in view of the developments which took place, an agreement was concluded on the 23rd January, 1899, by His Majesty's Government with the sheikh binding him, his heirs and successors not to cede, sell, lease, mortgage, or otherwise give for

the British Government, or to receive the agent of any foreign Power at Kuwait. His Majesty's Government, on their part, assured the sheikh of their good offices. The relations of the sheikh with the Ottoman Government remained in a more or less unsatisfactory condition until September 1901, when a temporary settlement was reached. The Ottoman Government agreed not to send troops to Kuwait, and that they would maintain the *status quo* there on condition that His Majesty's Government would not occupy the place or establish a British

protectorate; and the Marquess of Lansdowne gave an assurance to the Turkish Ambassador to that effect.

4. The sheikh's promise of 1899 as to non-alienation of territory was confirmed in a secret agreement of the 15th October, 1907, respecting the lease of the Bunder Shiveikh lands; and these two agreements continued until July 1913 to form the basis of British relations with Koweit.

5. The British and Ottoman Governments, having felt for some years that it was desirable formally to regularise the situation at Koweit, arrived at the agreement contained in articles 1-10 of the Anglo-Turkish Convention of the 29th July, 1913,* by the terms of which the territory of Koweit was recognised as an autonomous kaza of the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman flag was to be flown by the sheikh, but he was to have the right to insert a distinctive emblem in the corner; he was to continue to be a Turkish kaimakam; and his successors were to be appointed to a similar position by the Ottoman Government. The boundaries of the sheikh's immediate territory and his wider tribal jurisdiction were delimited; the Ottoman Government recognised the existing agreements between the sheikh and His Majesty's Government, and His Majesty's Government undertook, on their part, not to alter the nature of British relations with the Government of Koweit, or to establish a protectorate there, so long as the *status quo* as defined in the convention underwent no change.

6. On the 8th August, 1914, Sheikh Mubarak was informed officially by the officiating Resident in the Persian Gulf that a state of war existed between Great Britain and Germany, and on the 21st August he made a declaration of loyalty to His Majesty's Government on behalf of himself and his tribes, placed "his efforts, his men and his ships" at Great Britain's disposal and expressed a desire to eject the Turkish garrisons from the islands at the mouth of the Shatt-el-Arab, which he claimed to be lawfully his. He repeated this declaration in a letter of the same date to the officiating Resident in the Persian Gulf, which was formally acknowledged by the latter on the 25th August, 1914.

7. In view of the increasing likelihood that Turkey would intervene in the war on Germany's side, it became clear that His Majesty's Government's previous undertakings to the Sheikh of Koweit would have to be renewed, and contingently extended, against the event of a state of war arising between Great Britain and Turkey. Accordingly a letter containing the following assurances was despatched to the sheikh on the 3rd November, 1914, by the acting Resident in the Gulf:—

"In return for the valuable co-operation which we expect from you, I am authorised by the Government, in the event of annexation—and, insha Allah, we shall succeed—to assure you again that Basra will never again be subject to Turkish authority.

"I am further to give your Excellency personally the following special assurances:—

"(1.) The date gardens which you now possess between Fao and Gurnak shall remain in the full possession of you and your heirs, and for ever be immune from taxation.

"(2.) You are guaranteed by the great British Government against all consequences of your attack against Safwan, Umm Kasr and Bubiyan.

"(3.) Koweit shall be recognised as an independent principality under British protection."

8. On the 28th February, 1917, upon the death of Sheikh Mubarak-bin-Subah, these undertakings were renewed in the "Kharita" to his son, and after the latter had also died and had been succeeded by his brother, Sheikh Salim-bin-Mubarak, the Government of India forwarded to Sir P. Cox, for presentation to the new ruler, a "Kharita" from the Viceroy renewing to him likewise the undertakings given to his father.

9. Sheikh Salim, during the first half of 1918, made considerable difficulties for His Majesty's Government over the question of the control of the blockade in Koweit territories and ports, and in that connection the following message was conveyed to him through the Resident at Koweit on the 5th July, 1918:—

"Government have deeply regretted the events of the last two years at Koweit, but they welcome your declaration as affording an opportunity for re-establishment of our traditional friendship. In order that there may be no

* This convention was never ratified.

† Accepting the measures of control desired by the British authorities.

misunderstanding in the future, they desire to explain their policy towards your Excellency.

"On the one hand, should you show to Government same friendship and assistance which they have experienced for many years in their dealings with the rulers of Koweit, they will continue to you the assurances given to your illustrious father, the late Sheikh Mubarak, especially that 'the town of Koweit and its boundaries likewise belong to Sheikh Mubarak-us-Subah, ruler of Koweit, and to his heirs after him,'* and will extend to you the friendship and protection and assistance which they gave to him; and, finally, they hope that you will raise the name of your house and of Koweit to the high position which it held in the past in eyes of British Government and of peoples of Arabia.

"On the other hand, it is the plain duty of ruler of a State which is on terms of friendship with Government to prevent all acts, either by his own subjects or by other persons in his territory, which may be contrary to interests of Government; and since they know that, if you wish to do so, you have the power to control your subjects and others in your territory, Government will be compelled to hold your Excellency personally responsible should any such act unfortunately be committed in future. They hope your Excellency will fully realise your responsibility as the ruler of Koweit towards Government under whose protection and friendship Koweit has so greatly prospered in the past, and will understand that prosperity depends entirely on preservation of true friendship, both in word and deed, with Government."

10. The Political Resident in the Persian Gulf having apparently suggested, in November 1918, the declaration of British protectorates over Bahrain, Koweit, &c., the Viceroy considered that such declaration would (1) excite the suspicions of the neighbouring peoples, who would regard it as a prelude to annexation, and (2) provoke jealousy of other Powers, and involve us in heavy obligations, both military and financial. The Viceroy suggested that the better policy would be at an inter-Allied conference to put our cards frankly on the table, explaining our special interests and prescriptive position in the Persian Gulf, and the measures into which we have been driven by the special protection of those interests, and to express the hope that those interests and position might be fully recognised without need for further definition.

11. In December 1919 the Civil Commissioner at Bagdad raised again the question of the making of a jurisdictional Order in Council for Koweit (which question, as will be seen on reference to my memorandum in E 7015/6881/61/1921, was considered in 1911 and then left over until a settlement should have been arrived at with Turkey in regard to the Arab littoral), but the India Office considered that although the order was desirable in itself, and there would be an advantage in issuing it at an early date, that moment, when the question of the machinery for the administration of the mandate for Mesopotamia was unsettled, and the effect of the mandate upon the relations of His Majesty's Government with contiguous countries was still uncertain, did not appear opportune for its issue, a view that was endorsed by this Office.

12. On the 9th July, 1921, the Colonial Office, who had become responsible for policy on the Arab littoral of the Persian Gulf, communicated an enquiry from the High Commissioner, Bagdad, as to the status of Koweit as a result of the war, and asking whether it could not be placed on a similar basis to that of Bahrain, and whether an Order in Council could not be issued now that Turkey had lost sovereignty over it. The Colonial Office were told in reply that, from the legal point of view and on the supposition that there was no intention of including Koweit within the boundaries of Mesopotamia, the status of that territory would seem to be governed by article 132 of the Treaty of Peace.† In practice, provided some prior agreement were reached with the Sultan of Koweit, it would appear unlikely that any foreign Power would challenge the issue of an Order in Council on the lines of "The Bahrain Order in Council, 1913," although the extension of British jurisdiction, as in that order, to foreigners might involve the prior concurrence of some foreign Powers. It was further suggested to the Colonial Office that the High Commissioner, Bagdad, might be instructed to open negotiations with the Sultan with a view to ascertaining the measure of British supervision which the latter was prepared to accept, but that the

* From article 9 of secret agreement of the 15th October, 1907, referred to in paragraph 4.

† Not printed.

‡ By article 132 of the Treaty of Sèvres, Turkey renounced in favour of the Principal Allied Powers all rights and title over territories outside Europe not otherwise disposed of by the Treaty.

actual issue of any Order in Council consolidating any agreement that might be reached with the Sultan should be postponed until the coming into force of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey.

JOHN W. FIELD.

Foreign Office, March 20, 1922.

[E 5476/78/85]

No. 287.

The Earl of Balfour to the Secretary to the Cabinet.—(Received May 20.)

Sir,

Genoa, May 17, 1922.

YOU will be aware, from the telegrams I have despatched to London during the last week and from my despatch dated the 12th May, of the situation which has arisen at the Council during its present session over the request which I put forward at the first meeting, on the 11th May, that the terms of the mandate for Palestine should now be formally approved by the Council with an announcement of their intention to issue it in that form as soon as the Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Turkey has been concluded.

2. Two elements have militated against success attending my efforts to induce the Council to take on this occasion the action desired: the first being the fact that the question of the Palestine mandate was not formally on the agenda of the Council as circulated to its members beforehand.

3. This was due, of course, to the desire of His Majesty's Government to await the assent of the United States Government to the communication to the Council of the notes which had been exchanged between the two Governments on the subject. That assent was not forthcoming on the day the Council met and has now, in fact, been withheld, although the United States Government have, on their own account, published a statement of their attitude on this question and have said that they are no objection to the result of the negotiations with His Majesty's Government being explained to the Council.

4. The non-appearance of the question on the agenda undoubtedly gave the impression (unwarranted, I admit, but nevertheless inevitable) that the question was being rushed through the Council without proper consideration, and it is now clear that it would have been wiser to have placed the question formally on the agenda some weeks ago and then to have withdrawn it at the last moment if the negotiations with the United States Government had not happily concluded in time.

5. The second obstacle which has been encountered—unexpectedly so far as I was concerned—has been the intervention of the Vatican, the result of which has become more and more evident as the deliberations of the Council proceed.

6. It was only after the first meeting of the Council that I received a copy of the despatch from His Majesty's Minister at the Vatican to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, No. 58 of the 13th April, but since that despatch was written the Vatican would seem to have redoubled its efforts to stir up opposition to the draft mandate for Palestine as it stands at present. At all events the extent of the campaign undertaken by the Vatican can scarcely have been realised in London. It is no exaggeration to say that the reluctance of the French, Polish, Spanish, Italian and Brazilian representatives on the Council to discuss now the Palestine mandate or the question of the chairmanship of the Holy Places Commission has been due to the representations which have been made to their Governments by the Papal representatives.

7. A certain reluctance on the part of Italy to discuss these two questions, except as part of a bargain over the general settlement in the Near East, was not, of course, unexpected after the action taken by the Italian representative at the sixteenth session of the Council last January, which was reported in detail to the Cabinet at the time by Mr. Cecil Harmsworth, M.P., who represented His Majesty's Government on the Council at that session.

8. The arguments of the French Government (contained in M. Poincaré's note to His Majesty's Ambassador in Paris dated the 10th May) as to the ill-effects of a premature approval of the Palestine mandate on the mandate for Syria and the position of France in that country, also possess some force and appear to me difficult either to answer or to ignore.

9. Such was, briefly, the situation as disclosed after I had invited the Council to place the Palestine mandate on the agenda for discussion at the present session, and in the circumstances I decided to ask for a public meeting of the Council in

order that I might make clear to the world at large the position of His Majesty's Government, and counteract if possible the statements which have been circulated broadcast that His Majesty's Government, in carrying out the terms of the mandate, would permit themselves to be unduly influenced by one or other of the powerful religious organisations which are interested in that country.

10. At the public sitting held to-day I accordingly made a statement as follows:—

"M. le Président: I had hoped that in the course of the discussions that take place at this meeting of the Council it would have proved possible to make one step forward in the direction of a final settlement of all these mandates connected with the Middle East. I have been disappointed; but do not let anybody suppose that the disappointment is due either to the fact that the absence of discussion at this meeting delays the final settlement of the problem, or because I am afraid that the general policy which the Allied and Associated Powers and the League of Nations have endorsed is in the smallest danger. Neither of these preoccupations have animated me on this occasion. As regards the final juridical date at which the mandates for the Middle East will become part of a fixed and authoritative law of nations, that can only be when the Treaty of Sévres is finally ratified. But please remember that that is a purely technical point. The Treaty of Sévres and the remodelling of the Treaty of Sévres have nothing whatever to do with the policy of mandates either in the Near East or anywhere else. Grave questions undoubtedly are going to be discussed, and have been already discussed among the interested Powers with regard to certain provisions in the Treaty of Sévres; but those parts of the Treaty of Sévres which refer either to the general policy of mandates or to the particular mandates required in the Middle East, those parts of the Treaty of Sévres have never been, and are not going to be, subject to discussion among the Allied and Associated Powers. Therefore, when I say that nothing that this Council at this meeting will do, no number of resolutions that we pass, will make the juridical date earlier than it would otherwise have been, you will observe that I am dealing with a purely technical point which has no relation to the substantial policy with which we are concerned.

"Let me repeat that the general policy has already been decided, and is outside any discussion which could take place round this table. There is not the slightest doubt that the views which the Allied and Associated Powers have explicitly declared are not going to be reversed. Nobody need be under the least fear, and nobody, let me add, need entertain the least hope, that those broad lines of policy are going to suffer any alteration. My regret, therefore, that the discussion has had to be postponed has no relation to the fundamental considerations on which I have just dwelt. It is based purely upon administrative expediency. I ask you to remember not merely that the task thrown upon the mandatory in Palestine is one of great delicacy and difficulty, but that it is also one which requires for its adequate development the obtaining of large pecuniary resources. Unless we are able, as I am confident that ultimately we shall be able, so to develop the economic capacities of Palestine as to enable it to support a much larger population in much greater comfort than is at present possible, then our hopes as to the future of the country are, no doubt, doomed to disappointment. Money, therefore, is required; productive capital is absolutely necessary; and everybody who knows the present condition of the world, and the difficulty of obtaining important sums for any purpose whatever, must be perfectly well aware that anything which postpones, or even appears to postpone, the final and definitive settlement of our problem, discourages the lenders, and makes it more difficult to obtain their much-needed assistance. I hope, therefore, that all my colleagues on the Council will remember that we—the Government I represent—feel ourselves in rather a special position as regards the duties thrown upon us by the mandate, and that in the interests of sound administration every step taken towards the technical regularisation of our position is of the utmost possible value.

"Now I believe the public have been puzzled, and perhaps not unnaturally puzzled, by the delay which has occurred in connection with this mandate; and, being puzzled, some of them say: 'Well, is this delay due to any indecision on the part of either of the Allied and Associated Powers, or of the Council of the League of Nations, or of the mandatory Powers? Are any of these authorities shrinking from the policy already declared?' In other words, they are inclined to interpret delay as a sign of indecision. The error is a grave one; but I think I can dissipate it by explaining in a very few words how the difficulties have occurred. I have already referred to the fact that so far as the embodiment of our policy in a final treaty is concerned, that has suffered delay not at all because of any question

connected with the mandates, but because other questions wholly alien to the mandate problem have preoccupied the Powers who are signatories of the Treaty of Sévres. On this point I need say no more. But there is another point which I do not think is fully understood by the public, and on which perhaps my colleagues will allow me, as this is a public session, to say a word in order to dissipate prevailing misconceptions.

"Under the Treaty of Versailles and the Treaty of Sévres it was always contemplated that America, who had signed those treaties, would also share in the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles, and would become in that sense a full party to all the responsibilities and all the labours of the Allied Powers. You all know that for various reasons, which I need not discuss, that consummation has not been reached; but America very naturally said: 'The fact that I have not ratified the Treaty of Versailles does not interfere with my rights, or even my duties, as one of the Allied and Associated Powers in connection with the territories which the victory of the Allied and Associated Powers placed in their hands at the conclusion of a successful war.' And America has therefore claimed that she shall have a voice in the mandates, the sort of voice which she would have had, had she been a member of the League of Nations, and had she occupied the seat which still awaits her should she wish to occupy it at this table. The result of this action on the part of the American Government is that a fresh series of discussions had necessarily to take place between them and the Allies upon these problems. Great Britain, for example, has been discussing with the American Government the terms of the mandate, and we are in entire agreement about it. They cordially accept the principle of the mandate in its entirety; and I believe, though I have had no official intimation of the facts, that in addition to this action of the American Government, the American Senate has unanimously expressed its approval of the policy embodied in the Palestinian mandate. But all this has to be put in treaty form. Diplomacy moves slowly. And it was not till the very eve of the meeting of this Council that we received the final statement from our American friends, the general tenor of which I have already explained to you. We received it so late that it was quite impossible for the British Government to give that notice to our colleagues, which of course we should otherwise have done had we intended to raise this question at the Council. The result was that when I came to Geneva this question was not on the agreed agenda, and I had to ask permission of my colleagues to allow me to raise it. They felt, or some of them felt (I dare say all of them felt), but at all events some of them felt, that while there was probably no objection at all to the substance of anything proposed, they had not had sufficient notice either to enable them to discuss the question with their own Governments or to enable those Governments themselves to consider whether this method of dealing with one mandate at a time in the Middle East was or was not a convenient method of procedure from a general point of view. They therefore felt, not unnaturally, that they ought not, in the English phrase, to be 'rushed' in the matter. The last thing that the British Government desires, of course, is to rush anybody into any proposal which they have not had time to consider, and I make no complaint against the action taken. I only want my colleagues to remember that it is an action which has had some inconvenient repercussion in Palestine itself from the administrative point of view.

"You will see, therefore, that the delay, however serious may be its practical effects, in no sense touches any of the broad questions of principle in which the public are interested. Many of them, I think, are in error as to the powers of the League of Nations or of this Council, which for many purposes represents the League; they are in error, I say, as to the powers which these bodies possess in regard to mandates.

"The mandates are not our creation. The mandates are neither made by the League nor can they in substance be altered by the League. Our duties are of two kinds. It is our business in the first place to see that the specific and detailed terms of the mandates are in accordance with the decisions come to by the Allied and Associated Powers in article 22 of the Treaty of Versailles, and, in the second place, to see that, in carrying out those mandates, the mandatory Power shall be under the supervision—not the control, but the supervision—of the League of Nations, which possesses an admirable organisation through which it can obtain the fullest information as to the method in which each mandatory Power fulfils the duties which are entrusted to it.

"Remember that a mandate is a self-imposed limitation by the conquerors on the sovereignty which they obtained over conquered territories. It is imposed by the Allied and Associated Powers on themselves in the interests of what they conceived

to be the general welfare of mankind; and they have asked the League of Nations to assist them in seeing that this policy should be carried into effect. But the League of Nations is not the author of the policy, but its instrument. It is not they who have invented the system of mandates; it is not they who have laid down the general lines on which the three classes of mandates are framed; their duty, let me repeat, is to see in the first place that the terms of the mandates conform to the principles of the Covenant, and, in the second place, that these terms shall in fact regulate the policy of the mandatory Powers in the mandated territories.

"Now it is clear from this statement that both those who hope and those who fear that what I believe has been called the 'Balfour Declaration' is going to suffer substantial modifications, are in error. The fears are not justified, the hopes are not justified. The general lines of policy stand, and must stand. I am aware, of course, that a certain wave of anxiety has affected some sections of opinion lest this mandatory system as applied to Palestine should have an injurious effect upon the religious interests of this or that great Christian body. I confess to feeling, I will not say indignation—that would be too strong a word—but surprise, that any human being should suppose that Christian interests should suffer by the transfer of power in Palestine from a Mahomedan to a Christian Power; and, frankly, my surprise is not diminished when I reflect that that Christian Power is Great Britain. I venture boldly to claim for my country—and I do not believe that anybody who listens to me or who does me the honour to read what I say will contest the claim—that no Power has shown itself more equitable in its treatment of different religious creeds, more anxious to avoid offending religious susceptibilities. We have had immense experience in dealing with religions other than Christian. And, as regards the various forms of the Christian religion, everybody will admit who knows anything about the practice of my country, that we have shown the utmost fairness and the utmost generosity in dealing even with those denominations from which the majority of our population widely differ. We are a Protestant country, but I boldly say that I do not believe that in any country, Protestant or Catholic, has the Catholic religion received fairer or more generous treatment than it has within the British Isles. Now, is it credible, that when you have by the fortune of war taken away from a Mahomedan country and put under a Christian mandatory places which have sacred associations for large bodies of Christian believers, is it credible, I ask, that these should suffer by the transfer? And remember that whatever is done in Palestine now or in the future is done in the light of day. The machinery of the Mandates Commission, the machinery of the Council of the League of Nations, the machinery of the Assembly of the League are all contrived to make it quite impossible that any transaction of general interest should take place except in the full glare of the noonday sun of public opinion. And to suppose that in those circumstances there is the least chance of deliberate injustice or careless administration being either practised or permitted in Palestine seems to me one of the most extravagant and baseless fears by which any body of men were ever assailed.

"I have explained, I am afraid at great length, but I hope with adequate detail and lucidity, exactly the position in which, as I conceive it, the general mandate question for Palestine and the Near East stands. I have explained why all the regrettable delay has occurred; I have explained why the final juridical settlement of the whole question is still in the future; I have explained that this in no sense involves a modification of the lines of Palestinian policy laid down by the Allied Powers and emphatically endorsed by America. I have indicated also why it is that I am most anxious that a step forward should be taken as soon as possible in the interests of Palestinian administration. You will permit me, therefore, M. le Président, to conclude by asking my colleagues to agree to a proposal under which this question shall come up again before a future meeting of the Council, and I would suggest that that meeting should be held within the next six weeks."

11. My observations were well received by my colleagues on the Council. The Japanese representative immediately, without any suggestion on my part, gave my proposal for a special meeting of the Council in six weeks' time to consider the Palestine and other mandates his entire support. The French and Italian representatives, whilst supporting my conclusions, pleaded for a little elasticity as regarded the date of the special meeting of the Council. They agreed that the policy which the Allied and Associated Powers had pursued since the Treaty of Peace as regards mandated territories had not changed and never would be modified. After some further discussion, which will be found in the minutes of the eleventh meeting,

it was agreed that a special session of the Council should be held not later than the 15th July next to deal specially with the "A" and "B" mandates.

12. Before concluding this despatch I desire to urge upon the Government at home the necessity of entering at once into communication with the various Governments represented on the Council as well as with the Government of the United States, in order to secure a final settlement of the mandates in July next. It also seems to me desirable that action should be taken to explain fully and frankly to the Vatican the objects of the policy to be pursued by His Majesty's Government in Palestine. Further it is important that nothing should be left undone to expedite an agreement between the French and United States Governments as to the Syrian mandate, and an agreement between the French, ourselves and the United States over the "B" mandates. If this can be accomplished before the special meeting of the Council in July, I am confident that no further obstacle to the formal approval of the Palestine mandate will be encountered.

I am, &c.
BALFOUR.

C 8635/8635/22

No. 288

The Earl of Balfour to Sir R. Graham (Home).

(No. 819.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, June 14, 1922.

The Italian Ambassador called upon me this afternoon, and informed me that there was some possibility of Signor Schanzer visiting London on his way from Copenhagen to Italy, and that if he did so it would be in the hope of discussing with the British Government some arrangement by which the close co-operation of the two countries in matters of common interest, especially in the Eastern Mediterranean, might be secured.

I expressed myself as anxious to draw closer the bonds of friendship between our two countries, and asked him what exactly the Italian Government had in view, adding that the rough draft of an agreement which Signor Schanzer had shown to the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister in turn had shown to me seemed too vague, as it stood, to be of much practical value.

He referred at once to the tripartite treaty, and seemed desirous that the advantages which this would have conferred upon Italy should be revived. He drew a picture of Italian agriculturists and workmen developing the resources of the thinly populated regions in South-west Anatolia, which, if they could be realised, would doubtless confer a great benefit upon Italy and her superabundant population. But beyond generalities he did not go.

I told him that, so far as I was aware, we had no national aspirations which could in any way clash with those of Italy. What we were most anxious for at the moment was to bring peace in the Near East; to preserve the Greek population of Smyrna; to secure for it some reasonable Government; and endeavour to maintain the international control of the Straits.

With all these objects he expressed sympathy, incidentally observing, however, that the French had already made a separate peace with Kemal, and that Italy had no troops available to carry out any policy which required force behind it.

Speaking generally, our conversation left in my mind the impression that what the Italian Government most desired was to find some plausible answer to the charge that, so far as the Eastern Mediterranean was concerned, Italy had come out of a victorious war in a position less favourable than she possessed before the war began. He had apparently, however, no very clear ideas as to how this object should be accomplished.

I am, &c.
BALFOUR.